The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE Assembly in May requested the churches to consider the question of union with the Presbyterians and to send their conclusions to the Memorial Hall by 31st December of this year. It was decided that the request should be conveyed in a letter setting forth the salient points at issue, and discussion—which was surprisingly brief—was mostly concerned with a request from the Council that the letter should indicate that there is a marked difference of opinion in the Council itself as to the possibility of union. The argument was put forward that nothing should be said about the division in the Council so that the churches should not be in any way influenced. This struck us as rather a strange argument, and it would seem that the function of the Council calls for some clarification. It is quite true, of course, that the ultimate decision in such matters rests with the churches, but would an indication of the Council's attitude, not to say the giving of a lead, violate Congregational principles? Some Congregationalists seem to think that if a number of Christians come together as a church meeting, they are more likely to reach the mind of Christ than a company of equally good and perhaps better informed Christians who meet as a diaconate, committee or council. Surely the guidance of the Holy Spirit is not confined to church meetings! Indeed, the mere fact that a gathering is a "church meeting" does not ensure that the guidance of God will be given to it at all. The possibility of guidance depends on the enlightened minds and receptive spirits of those who come together, no matter how their meeting be constituted or what name be given to it. On the questions involved in union with the Presbyterians the Council is certainly better informed than most church meetings are likely to be, and it is a serious matter if we have to admit that such a selected body of ministers and laymen is less receptive to the influence of the Holy Spirit. (We suspect that some church meetings will be "guided" by the minister or one or two "strong" laymen—which may or may not be the guidance of God.) It seems to us entirely proper that the attitude of the Council should be known to the churches. We should think it right if the Council were unanimously for or against union; we think it not less right now that it is divided. For this division, which will be reproduced in many churches and

myself received". Such evils as exist in mental institutions are due chiefly to shortage of staff. A medical officer in an asylum is required, says Mr. Vincent, to attend to about eight hundred patients and to do a multitude of other things. When cases of ill-treatment occur—and they do not appear to be frequent—they are often due to shortage of nurses and inadequate supervision. The Government, which has lately issued valuable reports on the care of children and old people, would do well to hold a similar enquiry into the lot of the mentally afflicted. Such an impartial investigation would bring to life the evils which do exist, and would allay those groundless misapprehensions which are a legacy from the days when an excursion to Bedlam was an amusing way of spending an afternoon.

The care of the insane must be one of the most exacting tasks in life, but there can hardly be a more obviously Christian vocation. Young men and women with the necessary qualities of character, who really want to devote themselves to the service of their fellows, might well consider mental nursing as a career. Moreover, a large number of men and girls from our churches are in medical schools. It would be a great thing if those who are suitable decided to turn to psychiatry. There is an appalling shortage of medical psychologists—especially Christian ones. London may be fairly well served but the need of the provinces is desperate. If there were throughout the country a sufficient number of good psychiatrists, many mental patients would be helped in time and would never need to go "inside the asylum".

* * *

A good deal has been written on world government by Mr. Emery Reves, Mr. Lionel Curtis and others. A group of British M.P.s, supported by many of their fellow members and other influential people like Lord Beveridge and Earl Russell, have now gone further and have launched a campaign for world government by 1955. Their plan was endorsed by a world government conference held at Montreux in August 1947 and attended by representatives of twenty nations. The plan proposes that another world organization should be created to replace UNO "with membership open to all the nations of the world who are willing to forego national sovereignty in order to achieve peace." It is proposed to hold a People's World Constituent Assembly in Geneva in the autumn of 1950 composed of representatives (one per million of the population) elected by nation-wide ballots held in all the participating countries in the summer of 1950. In the United Kingdom those who wish to stand as candidates will offer themselves for selection to the Parliamentary Group, which now meets weekly at the House of Commons. We understand that men of the calibre of Lord Beveridge and Sir John Boyd Orr have already said that they are

willing to stand. A ballot paper, containing the names of selected candidates, will be sent to all citizens whose names appear on the Parliamentary Electoral Register, and by this means the people of England (Scotland, Ireland and Wales being separate "constituencies") will be asked to choose 38 representatives. All this will, of course, mean a great deal of publicity work, and the committee estimates that in England alone half-a-million voluntary workers and a million pounds will be needed.

In 1950 the Assembly will meet at Geneva and by the summer of 1951 will have drawn up the Charter of World Government. This constituent assembly will then be dissolved and it will be the responsibility of the nations to see that their governments ratify the Charter.

> At the first General Election subsequent to the completion of the Charter, supporters of the Crusade for World Government will seek to ensure that the ratification of the Charter is a prominent plank in the platform of each of the major parties. Every candidate for election to Parliament at Westminster will then be asked for a pledge of his support for the ratification of the Charter. We believe that if, in the United Kingdom, during the course of the Crusade for World Government, we have persuaded a quarter of the population to take part in the unofficial ballot, it is a political certainty that at the subsequent General Election we can induce the new Parliament in Westminster to ratify the Geneva Charter. It will be the task of the peoples of every country to ensure that the Charter is ratified by their own national Parliaments, each people taking such action as it thinks best fitted to achieve that end.

The sponsors of the plan claim that a great deal of support for it is already forthcoming in America and other countries. What about Russia? Some people believe that if virtually all other nations accepted the charter she would not be able to hold aloof. That may be wishful thinking but, in any event, uncertainty as to Russia's attitude must not be allowed to cripple the effort to secure world government. Time is the vital factor as Sir Stafford Cripps points out in the following passage:

> World federation has hitherto been looked upon as a very long term objective, but the atomic bomb has telescoped history and made it impossible for us to wait long years of acute danger of war, because from that war civilization and mankind cannot survive. . . . We may have a few years yet in which the atomic bomb is not a common weapon in the hands of all major Powers, but they will be pitifully few compared to the immense task that confronts us. This is a matter which must be taken up by everyone and not merely by a few overworked statesmen. It is essentially a job in which the driving power must come from the common men and women all over the world. I do not doubt the willingness of statesmen, but the

> task is so great and so urgent that we cannot hope to get it carried through unless we have the driving power of world public opinion behind it.

Mr. Ernest Bevin committed himself to support such a movement in a speech in the House of Commons in November 1945:

> We need a new study for the purpose of creating a World Assembly *elected directly from the people of the world*! (Italics ours). I am willing to sit with anybody, of any party, of any nation, to try to devise a franchise or a constitution for a World Assembly. Once we can get to that stage I believe we shall have taken a great step.

As Sir Stafford Cripps points out, the achievement of world government is ultimately the responsibility not of statesmen but of ordinary men and women everywhere. People continually complain of their sense of frustration. There is, they say, nothing that we can do in face of the appalling dangers which confront us. But everyone can get to work in this crusade for world government, and the sense of playing a part, however small, will do something to lift the sense of frustration which presses so heavily on those who allow themselves to be mere helpless spectators of the world's tragedy. The Hon. Secretary of the crusade is Mr. H. C. Usborne, M.P., and contact can be made with him at the House of Commons.

* * *

We recently travelled on the 2.15 Manchester express from St. Pancras behind the new diesel-electric engine, No. 10,000. Her performance was impressive. Despite repeated checks after Bedford she reached Leicester dead on time. When the ticket collector visited us we were sitting, watch in hand, with eyes on the distance posts which were beginning to seem like palings in a fence! We calculated the speed at something over eighty, but the collector said that, if we were lucky, we should cover two miles beyond Luton in 76 seconds, which works out at 94.7 miles per hour.

Yes, it was all very impressive, but we must confess to a feeling of disappointment when we made our customary expedition to see the engine before the journey began, and we were not much more reconciled to the monster when it ended. A great steam-engine is a thing of romance, of life and personality, but this had no individuality. As we rushed through stations people turned to look, and even signalmen thrust their heads out of their boxes. But will the day come when all the great expresses are hauled by diesel engines and, if it does, will boys of all sizes still perch on the bridge at Crewe as thick as starlings on Birmingham Town Hall? Or will the fascination of watching engines and collecting their numbers be gone? Some stations have just been closed to devotees of the cult. At Tamworth, it is officially stated, as many as 250 boys, some from as far afield as Bristol and Swansea,

would invade the station platforms. They must be aggrieved at such a blow to their hobby (with some it was more like a religion !). It may be that their sons or grandsons will never know the thrill of watching a G.W.R. "King" or a "Royal Scot", and they will wonder what all the bother was about.

* * *

ANOTHER sidelight on the paper situation:

> Mr. C. A. Bannister, East Field Primary School, Wolverhampton said (to the Conference of the National Association of Head Teachers at Grimsby) that four dozen Bibles ordered a year ago had not been delivered. The contractors had informed him that orders in 1946 from other schools were still outstanding. "Are we exporting spiritual food?" he asked.

* * *

IN these days even people who have a mind to be honest find it hard to resist the multitude of regulations designed (presumably) to ensure a fair distribution of the necessities and luxuries of life. Occasionally the Government seems to set itself to prove that honesty—whatever else it may be—is not the best-paying policy. We suppose there must be a more reasonable explanation of the refusal to grant a basic petrol ration to those who already have a supplementary allowance, but we do not know what it is. Motorists who have a supplementary allowance are now told that they must squeeze their pleasure motoring out of it. The man who applied for, and obtained, more than he really needed can, of course, do this without hardship. The honest man, who did not ask for a drop more than was strictly necessary for legitimate purposes, will not be able to drive a mile for pleasure without the uncomfortable feeling that he will have to pay for his joyride with inconvenience or worse.

* * *

NOT everybody who champions democracy realizes how closely its very existence is bound up with the preservation of religious liberty. It is a point which has been urged by Professor John Macmurray in more than one of his books:

> It may seem an exaggeration to say that the achievement of religious toleration is the core of democracy itself. Is not this to give too high an importance to religion in shaping politics? No, it is not; for two reasons. The first is that the principle of religious freedom establishes the principle of the limitation of political authority. If government has no right to interfere with the religious life of its subjects, then there is a department of social life in which the political authority has no competence. It lies beyond the State's authority. . . . The second reason why the recognition of the freedom of religion from political control is fundamental is that it implies more than appears at first sight. It implies, in principle, the freedom of all cultural activities from State control. It implies freedom of conscience, freedom

> of thought, freedom of learning and of art and literature—in a word, all that is involved in freedom of mind. The implications of religious toleration run through all our democratic liberties—freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of the Press, of cultural association, of public criticism, and propaganda. For it accepts the principle that the man is more than a citizen, and that the State is merely an aspect, and not the most important aspect, of the community[1].

Mr. Cecil Northcott makes an important contribution to the discussion of this subject in his *Religious Liberty* (S.C.M., 6s.). Like everything he writes, the book is very lucid and readable. Mr. Northcott gives us an historical sketch of the struggle for religious liberty, and follows with a comprehensive survey of the position today showing how gravely it is threatened in many parts of the world. This is a book which should be read by all who care for the preservation and increase of liberty.

* * *

In preparation for the General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, which is to be held at Amsterdam in August, two study conferences were organized on "The Biblical Authority for the Churches' Social and Political Message Today". Thirteen well-known scholars, including Dr. Karl Barth and Dr. C. H. Dodd, set themselves to answer the question, "How do we get from the Bible to the modern world?" Is there a bridge of some sort, or is there a great chasm which can be crossed only by a leap of faith? A summary of the papers given and of the discussions has now been issued in mimeographed form under the title *From the Bible to the Modern World.* It can be obtained (price 3s. 6d.) from Miss S. Morden, World Council of Churches, 7 Kensington Church Court, London, W.8.

* * *

Mansfield College has made such a great contribution to the Free Church life of the country, and not to Congregationalism alone, that an account of its history should be of interest to many besides its *alumni.* Dr. W. T. Pennar Davies has written a concise account of its origin and development in *Mansfield College: Its History, Aims and Achievements,* which can be obtained from the Bursar of the College for half-a-crown. Dr. Davies has compressed a great deal of information into some 50 pages and, quite apart from the merit of his own book, has succeeded in whetting our appetite for more. A most interesting and valuable book could be written by a Mansfield man with a longer memory than Dr. Davies', who could bring to life some of the great personalities associated with the College and, perhaps, others who never became "figures" in their denomination or in the world of scholarship.

[1] *Constructive Democracy,* pp. 11 f.

SOME QUESTIONS ARISING FROM RECENT DISCUSSIONS OF BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION

By James Gray, M.A.

I

There is no more lively topic in Anglican theological circles than "Confirmation Today". The publication in 1944 of a document with that title, "being the Schedule attached to the Interim Reports of the Joint Committees on Confirmation setting forth certain major issues before the Church, as presented to the Convocations of Canterbury and York", has been followed by numerous articles and letters in periodicals, notably in *Theology*, and by a number of important pamphlets, the weightiest of which is Gregory Dix's *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism*.

Now to a mere Free Churchman it is not very clear what is the exact meaning and status of "a schedule attached to the interim reports of the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York" (no Free Church document could achieve a sub-title so like an incantation !); and for that reason it is perhaps presumptuous for a Free Churchman to venture some observations on a topic which might appear to be mainly domestic. From a reading of the Schedule it can be gathered that the whole matter is open for discussion prior to specific recommendations being made later in the final report; and from conversation with Anglican friends and a perusal of some of the published discussions I have gathered that so far these recommendations have not been formulated, and that—to put it mildly—it may be some time before agreement is reached on the theological issues involved, and still more on the practical changes which may be required.

I hope I may be acquitted of the charge of presumption by urging that the matters arising out of this discussion are not merely of interest and concern to the Church of England. Even if they affected the Church of England alone they would still be of vital interest to other Churches, because of the significant place it occupies in the Church universal. But there are a good many Free Churchmen to whom these questions are not only of great interest but also of great importance and value: their connection with reunion is obvious, and they also constitute a challenge to our own thought and practice. We are not peering over the Anglican garden wall to gloat over their perplexities, the 'hopeless muddle'[1] in which

[1] The phrase is used by an Anglican scholar, R. H. Fuller, in a letter to *Theology*, April, 1946, p. 117.

the Church of England is struggling. Alas, our gardens are not noticeably more tidy or more productive.

But the response of such Free Churchmen to this challenge ought at least to make a useful contribution to the current discussion; and may even share in the movement of the Holy Spirit which these discussions are expressing—for surely we are not mistaken in discerning that the Spirit is at work in the present theological ferment.

The emergence of this set of topics at this particular time is partly due to the general direction which all theological study has been taking for the last twelve or fifteen years. The topic of 'the Church', as Gregory Dix has pointed out, "now bids fair to play in the intellectual history of Christendom in our twentieth century that dominant part which the topic of the Incarnation played in the fourth and fifth centuries".[2]

This general direction is itself partly due to the growth of the ecumenical movement, with its deepened sense of the sin of our divisions and its concern to find a sound basis for reunion. Sacraments, Creeds, Orders, which have all been causes of division, are being scrutinized afresh, both to find the precise points of disagreement amongst different Churches, and to find what is common ground. In this context the practice and the theology of Baptism and Confirmation are being re-examined.

The particular Church of England inquiry arose out of the practical situation in the country: for the twenty years or so up to 1936, out of every 100 children born in England and Wales, 67 were baptized in the Church of England, 26 were confirmed, only 9 continued as Easter communicants. The Joint Committees were set up to examine this situation. "The pertinent fact for this enquiry is that only one-third of the confirmed members of the Church of England make their Communion at Easter. The remaining two-thirds are missing. Why is this? How can it be remedied?"[3]

Clearly, serious pastoral questions are involved in that inquiry: and they are not concerned solely with ecclesiastical rights or wrongs or merely with matters of discipline or with current sacramental procedure. The urgency of these questions is that they are bound up with the effectiveness or otherwise of the Church's work in winning men for Christ. Those who are concerned with this issue of Confirmation and Baptism, if I understand them aright, are men who have pondered the great need of the world today, who are oppressed by its widespread and insidious secularism; and their root concern is that the Gospel should be understood by the people and its power made available to them, that the Sacraments should not obscure the Gospel but rather should have a manifest and vital connection with

2 *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism*, p. 5.

3 *Confirmation To-day*, p. 22. The statistics are referred to on pp. 21-22, and given in detail in Appendix I, pp. 57-58.

moral and spiritual reality. At any rate it is from this point of view that my own concern has been quickened: it is not just a lively topic for theological discussion, but a living issue for us all.

II

One of the aspects of the question which has received a good deal of attention is the early history of the laying on of hands in relation to Baptism. This is of special importance because of the great authority of the primitive Church, an authority recognized, though with varying emphases, by Protestant and Catholic alike.

There is firm ground from which to start at the end of the second century in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus and in Tertullian. The *Apostolic Tradition* represents the practice at Rome in the later second century, but may be taken as typical of the practice in other places as well, and was compiled, as Gregory Dix says, "as a record of this authoritative *paradosis* of practice at the time when its authority was first beginning to be disregarded",[4] and therefore may be taken to represent practice at a somewhat earlier date too.

The full account of the rite of Initiation contained in the *Apostolic Tradition* is well known. The only point it is necessary to mention here is that the rite included a number of elements all understood and practised as *one* rite; an anointing with oil (for exorcism), a threefold immersion in water, a second anointing on the head with chrism; after the candidates have dressed, there is a laying on of hands by the Bishop, a further anointing, a sealing on the forehead, and the kiss of peace; followed at once by first Communion. In particular there is no separation of 'Baptism' (*i.e.* immersion in water) from the laying on of hands. Christian Initiation here is *a single rite of Baptism*, a Baptism of water and of the Spirit. Gregory Dix uses the term *Baptisma* to include the whole rite.

For Tertullian too (in the *De Baptismo*, written perhaps ten years before the *Apostolic Tradition*) "*Baptismum* does not mean only the Baptism in water, but other things as well. 'Not that in the waters we obtain the Holy Spirit' (says Tertullian), 'but that cleansed in the water we are prepared for the Spirit. . . . Leaving the laver we are forthwith anointed in the blessed oil . . . then a hand is laid upon us, by its blessing calling down and inviting the Holy Ghost' ".[5]

There is a good deal of evidence, adduced briefly by Gregory Dix in his pamphlet and at length in Mason's *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, 1891, to show that other early writers use the term Baptism in this sense: in fact sometimes to include the whole rite, and sometimes to refer only to the immersion in water. "Thus Origen says that the Apostles gave the Holy Spirit in *Acts* 8 by the

[4] Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
[5] Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

imposition of hands '*after* the grace and renewal of Baptism', using the word in our modern sense. Yet a little earlier in the same chapter he had said that they gave the Spirit on the same occasion by the imposition of hands '*in* Baptism', using it in the wider sense''.[6]

The subsequent history of the rite is traced by Dix: there is the postponement of laying on of hands because, as the Church spread, the Bishops were not able to get round to the Churches often enough; Jerome's defence of this separation and his attribution of all the effects of the laying on of hands to Baptism in water ('for the first time in extant Christian literature', says Dix); the first use of the term *Confirmation* in the fifth century, indicating the change of emphasis then taking place in the West, *i.e.* that something already operative was being confirmed; there is the late fifth century Confirmation address by an anonymous French bishop, in which he said to the newly-confirmed: ''Perhaps some one is thinking to himself, 'What good can it do me after the mystery of Baptism to have the services of some one to Confirm me? So far as I can see, we have not obtained all from the font if, after the font, we still need something more'. That is not so, dear brethren. Listen to me! The Holy Ghost bestows at the font absolutely all that is needed to restore innocence. In Confirmation he provides an increase of grace (*augmentum praestat ad gratiam*). . . . In Baptism we are born to new life, after Baptism we are Confirmed for combat''. There is the accidental inclusion of these last two sentences in the ninth century Forged Decretals, and their becoming, through Gratian and Peter Lombard, the foundation of the whole Western medieval theology of Confirmation[7].

This story of declension from primitive thought and practice is regarded by this group of writers as the sad explanation of the thought and practice of the whole Western Church today, whether Roman, Anglican or Reformed; all are hopelessly ''post-medieval'', to use the phrase by which Gregory Dix indicates the fatal dependence of modern Western practice upon medieval practice, itself a sad declension from primitive practice.

There are many matters of great interest here; but we will retrace our steps and go from Tertullian and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus backwards towards the New Testament period, for it is in that direction that we must look for an authority which is recognized by all as having more weight than any subsequent history.

In Mason's treatise there is nothing cited of any significance in this matter between the New Testament and 200 A.D. ''Among the scanty remains of the Christian literature of the first century and a half there is hardly anything which bears on the doctrine of

[6] Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
[7] This is a very inadequate summary of a summary.

Confirmation. The Apostolic Fathers do not speak of it. Of Baptism itself they say but little, and though it may be assumed that Baptism, for them, included Confirmation, as a matter of course, there is no attempt on their part to analyse the constituent elements of the sacrament''.[8] Dr. Oulton, of Dublin, has recently questioned Dix's similar assumption that Tertullian and the *Apostolic Tradition* are normal and elsewhere to be regarded as implicit even though not actually mentioned. In *Theology*, March 1947, Dr. Oulton adduced a good deal of evidence from second century documents to show that the term 'the seal' is often used to mean the Baptism in water, and also to mean the whole rite. For example, Hermas says, ''The seal, then, is the water''. Similar passages are quoted from Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, and even Tertullian, to the same effect. Dix replied, in *Theology*, January 1948, and is not convinced by Oulton's argument that the use of the term 'seal' underwent a change towards the end of the second century, though he agrees ''that the loose use of the technical terms of the liturgy of initiation found in Jewish and Christian writers in the first century A.D. lasted on through the second and even the third centuries''.[9]

It is harder, I think, to feel convinced by Dix's attempt to account for the omission of any reference to the laying on of hands in either the *Didache* or the *Apology* of Justin Martyr; that omission remains puzzling.

Yet it seems to me that a very strong case has been made out for the oneness of the rite; and that even the varying usage of terms strengthens this conclusion, for even if it cannot be shown that at every Baptism there was also the laying on of hands, it is certainly clear that every reference to initiatory laying on of hands is closely related to Baptism.

III

In the historical field the ordinary student is to a considerable extent dependent upon the expert; but the New Testament is both a more restricted and a more familiar field, in which we all may claim some competence—and not without justification.

Gregory Dix's lecture does not deal in detail with the New Testament evidence, for two reasons: first, that Dr. L. S. Thornton has recently treated it (in an address at St. Albans in June 1945, published under the title *Confirmation Today*); second, that the liturgical tradition is older than the canonisation of the New Testament documents and therefore better evidence for primitive practice. Professor Ramsey has made a damaging criticism of Thornton's pamphlet (on the grounds that it uses a subjective

8 Mason, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
9 *Theology*, January, 1948, p. 11.

typology which is far from convincing as historical evidence of what the apostles actually believed and taught about baptism and the laying on of hands) in *Theology*, August 1946; and we can safely leave it aside for this reason, and also because it deals only with a small part of the New Testament evidence. Dix's further point is sound enough as emphasizing the evidential value of the *paradosis* of *practice;* but it will not do to depreciate the evidence of the New Testament on the dubious ground that its documents had little authority until the canon was formed. But Dix packed so much into one lecture (he says it lasted an hour, but if he read these 30 pages in an hour, his audience would be in a whirl before the end—and I doubt if it would be physically possible!), that it is ungrateful to expect a full treatment of the New Testament evidence as well. In fact he follows the detailed and cogently argued presentation of the evidence given in Mason's first chapter, of which the following is a summary.

It depends on three key-passages:

Acts 8, where Peter and John laid hands on the Samaritans who had been baptized but had not received the Holy Spirit.

Acts 19, where some at Ephesus who had previously been baptized into John's baptism and who did not even know of the existence of the Holy Spirit, were given Christian Baptism, and Paul laid his hands on them and the Holy Spirit came upon them.

Hebrews 6^{1-2}, where certain matters are said to belong to the elementary principles of Christianity (literally "the beginning of the word of Christ") and they include "teaching of baptisms and of laying on of hands", apparently closely connected.

In the first, it is difficult to avoid the impression the narrative gives that the apostles were surprised that the Samaritans had not received the Holy Spirit, as if it were the normal experience at Baptism; and their prayer and imposition of hands seems to them the natural thing to do to put right the defect.

In the second, it seems that Paul equally naturally proceeds to lay his hands on those who had just been baptized.

These two might have been regarded as exceptional cases but for the *Hebrews* passage, which seems to indicate conclusively that Baptism and laying on of hands were closely connected as a part of the basic paradosis of practice.

This foundation is built on by an attempt to interpret a considerable number of other New Testament passages as implying this intimate connection of Baptism in water with the laying on of hands, even when they are not unambiguously mentioned. When Peter at Pentecost said: "Repent ye, and be baptized unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (*Acts* 2^{38}), he was referring both to Baptism in water for remission of sins, and to the laying on of hands for the reception of the Holy Ghost.

The Cornelius incident (*Acts* 10) is expounded as clearly indicating a twofold gift (though Mason does not face the difficulty of the unusual sequence here).

The passage in *I Cor.* 10 where Paul says: "Our fathers were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea", is interpreted as symbolizing the two parts of the baptismal rite—the sea means Baptism in water (a momentary act), the cloud means the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (a continual presence).

I Cor. 12^{13}, "By one Spirit we were baptised into one body . . . and all are given the same Spirit to drink"—these again refer, though a little more obscurely, to the twofold experience.

Gal. 4^{4}, "God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under law . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons. And, because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, saying, Abba, Father". Again the adoption of sons refers to Baptism in water, the reception of the Spirit to Confirmation.

Finally, *Titus* 3^{4}, "He saved us through a laver of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit", is similarly interpreted.

"In all these passages", Mason sums up, " 'renewal' is not, like regeneration, a single act, which begins a new life, but it is the continual process by which the regenerate creature is gradually assimilated to the ideal for which he was made. . . . But . . . both these benefits have their origin at the baptismal laver".[10]

Finally he quotes numerous passages from the Epistles, some speaking of "washing", "cleansing", and "new creation", which would on his assumption naturally be connected with Baptism in water; and others, speaking of the Spirit, "being established", "anointed" or "sealed", which would naturally be connected with confirmation.

All this is very cogent and not lightly to be dismissed. And yet there are striking omissions in the Scripture references: all is built on the three *loci classici* which are taken as normal. As we have seen, they are very strong. But the fact remains that both in *Acts* and the *Epistles* there are far more numerous passages where there is no mention of laying on of hands—those in *Acts* recording Baptisms, where the one constant feature seems to be the Baptism in water; and those in the *Epistles* referring to Baptism, where its chief symbolic significance is derived from the burial in water or the washing, and where in fact the Baptism in water seems to be regarded as accompanied by the gift of the Spirit: in these cases it is special pleading which takes it for granted that Baptism is a term which invariably includes the laying on of hands.

The examination of the New Testament evidence in detail is a task too large to be undertaken in this article. But the following summary of evidence in *Acts* is enough to show that there is much

[10] *Op. cit.*, pp. 48-49.

to be set against the theory accepted by Mason, Dix and their followers. This form of presentation is quoted from Sherwin Bailey in *Theology*, January 1946, p. 12:

1. In one case (2^{38}) the gift of the Spirit is expressly stated to be a direct (and immediate?) consequence of baptism.

2. In one case (the Samaritans, $8^{9f.}$) the gift of the Spirit is not given as a result of baptism in the name of Jesus, but is conferred later by apostolic imposition of hands.

3. In one case (the Ethiopian, $8^{25f.}$) there is uncertainty on textual grounds. The 'Western' addition: "The Holy Spirit fell upon the eunuch . . . " is generally rejected; there is no evidence whether the Spirit was given by direct descent, or not at all.

4. In three cases (Lydia, 16^{15}, the jailor and his household, 16^{33}, many Corinthians, 18^{8}) converts are baptized but no mention is made of the Holy Spirit or of imposition of hands.

5. In one case (Cornelius, 10) the Spirit is given extraordinarily, and subsequent baptism regularizes the situation.

6. In one case (Apollos, $18^{24f.}$) of baptism by John, no re-baptism and no laying-on of hands is recorded, but there is evidence of possession by the Spirit (though no specific reference to Him).

7. In one group of "about twelve" cases at Ephesus (19^{1-7}) of baptisms by John, re-baptism (voluntary?) takes place, with imposition of hands, by which the Holy Spirit is given.

8. In one case (Paul, 9^{7-18}) a laying on of hands precedes baptism, but there is no indication whether this was for the restoration of Paul's sight (when this case must be added to those mentioned under 4) or for the conferring of the Holy Spirit.

In two cases only is the Spirit given by imposition of hands, and it is to these that appeal is usually made, when Confirmation is under discussion. "But", asks Sherwin Bailey, "what of the others?" It is a most pertinent question.

Of other passages perhaps I may mention the following: The ordinary non-technical use of the term 'baptism' and 'baptize' has no suggestion of laying on of hands about it. "I have a baptism to be baptized with"—the figure is of being immersed in suffering. In the absence of clear New Testament evidence it is not sound exegesis which assumes that 'Baptism' in the New Testament already includes both rites.

The classic passage in *Romans* 6 derives its significance from the burial in water and the rising again—the Baptism in water is the re-enactment of the central acts of our Redemption in the death and resurrection of our Lord. *Colossians* 2^{12} is similar. The Flood analogy in *I Peter* 3, and the connection of Baptism there with the resurrection, equally derive their significance from the Baptism in water.

Finally, I find it impossible to understand how S. Paul could write the passage in *I Corinthians* 1 if he as an apostle had normally laid hands on those who had just been baptized by some other Christian minister. Not only were the Corinthians not baptized into the name of Paul, but he had not even baptized any of them (except one family or so). "For Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel". If he had as a matter of regular practice laid apostolic hands on newly baptized Christians, would he not surely have been compelled to add some such qualifying phrase as "I only laid hands on you"? And if he had done this, surely it would have suggested unmistakably that the Baptism in water was the major rite. If in fact he had normally laid hands on the newly-baptized the argument as it stands would be open to the easy Corinthian retort, "But it was Paul who *laid hands on us*"—and if this was an apostolic prerogative, there would have been all the more justification for the Pauline party's pride.

This is not an exhaustive examination of the evidence, but it does show that the New Testament evidence, though inconclusive, is certainly not all pointing in the direction in which Mason and his successors would have us look.

What we need is a thorough survey of all the New Testament evidence (especially, as Dix suggests, in the light of all the *Jewish* evidence), not starting from the three passages which Mason takes as normative, but setting these passages in the context of the much larger number of passages where there is no mention of the laying on of hands.

The Bishop of Derby's recently published paper *Christian Initiation* does not give us the exhaustive survey that we need, though it is a valuable independent study of some of the evidence. He asks: "May it not be that in actual fact there may have existed, even in the earliest days of the Church, some diversity of use?"[11] After asserting that Christian Baptism was in the Apostolic age necessary for entry into the new Israel, and that the New Testament everywhere assumes that the Holy Spirit was bestowed upon Christians, "normally at least in immediate association with Baptism", he goes on: "Can we go further, and presume as invariable in the New Testament period the association with Baptism, as a specific means to the bestowal of the Spirit, of the further ceremony or rite of the imposition of hands, as in the episodes of *Acts* $8^{15\text{-}17}$, 19^{6}?"

To this Dr. Rawlinson replies: "I must confess that, for my own part, I should find it exceedingly difficult to answer this question with any assurance of certainty in the affirmative".[12] And later: " . . . in the New Testament . . . the primary emphasis is upon

[11] A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Christian Initiation*, p. 18.
[12] *Op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

Baptism, rather than upon anything corresponding to what has come to be called Confirmation".[13]

The still more recent Report of an Anglican Theological Commission is disappointingly slight, and in its discussion of the New Testament evidence does little more than record failure to agree, recognizing that there is a 'fluidity' in the accounts of initiations in the apostolic age, a fluidity which different members of the Commission would explain differently[14].

IV

This leads to the consideration of two, out of many, specifically theological questions which arise.

The first concerns the attempt, by some of the writers mentioned, to identify the precise gift conveyed by each distinct element in the whole baptismal rite. The immersion in water represents the negative side of the rite, it is said, and the imposition of hands the positive side. The Baptism in water is connected especially with forgiveness and cleansing, and also with regeneration, the new birth and incorporation into the Body of Christ; while the laying on of hands is connected with the gift of the Spirit.

One difficulty of this is that the more emphatically Confirmation is regarded as specifically conveying the gift of the Spirit, the more difficult it is to give content to the work of the Spirit in Baptism (as distinct from the laying on of hands). So we find Mason defending the view that the Spirit acts in Baptism as an *external agent* but comes in Confirmation as an *inward presence*. This is combined with an exegesis of *John* 14[17], "Ye know Him, because He abideth with you, and He shall be in you", which distinguishes between the Holy Spirit's being "with" the Apostles (before Pentecost) and being "in" them (after Pentecost); and with the contention that after Baptism the Spirit is "with" the baptized, but after Confirmation He is "in" them[15].

We are not surprised to learn that Canon Quick once told Professor Ramsey that "he found himself incapable of discussing this view since he could not understand what the distinction between an 'external' and an 'internal' action of the Spirit meant".[16]

Mason admits that the main difficulty for him "lies less in defining what Confirmation adds to Baptism than in defining what Baptism confers apart from Confirmation".[17] He has to acknowledge that whatever happens in Baptism is the work of the Spirit, and he says, "In a sense we 'receive' Him then". But one cannot escape the impression that the language is unsatisfactory not because

[13] *Op. cit.*, p. 27.
[14] *The Theology of Christian Initiation* (S.P.C.K., 1948), especially pp. 9-12.
[15] *Op. cit.*, pp. 432 ff.
[16] *Theology*, September, 1945.
[17] *Op. cit.*, p. 455.

of the great mystery of the Spirit's working, but because in the interests of a theory, a mechanical analysis is being attempted which is bound to lead to purely arbitrary sacramental dogmatism. Mason, and not he alone, exposes himself (as another writer[18] has put it) to the charge of *cacoethes definiendi,* which we may perhaps translate 'the cancer of over-definition'.

No doubt these tortuous abstractions would have been unnecessary if the primitive oneness of the whole rite has been everywhere retained, for then the varied spiritual significance of the whole initiation might have been connected with the different elements of the rite without undue danger and without doing violence to spiritual truth. Indeed it is hard to believe that any satisfactory theology of Baptism and Confirmation can emerge until somehow that primitive oneness is restored; and it is hard to see that this can be done merely by more correct *teaching* about the insufficiency of Baptism without Confirmation, while practice continues to separate the two by an interval of years. If Confirmation is exalted, the difficulty (as with Mason) is what content to give to Infant Baptism. If Baptism is made the crucial point, then the Confirmation inevitably sinks into the background as a very secondary rite, an addition to or Confirmation of something already given (as with Quick).

Second, there is raised inevitably the question of the relation of sacramental rites to spiritual experience. There is a neatness and a symmetry about the above scheme which carefully parcels out the work of the Spirit; but the parcels are packets of theory, not of experience. Those of us who firmly believe that the Gospel Sacraments are an integral part of Christian faith and life, not to be discarded as unspiritual, must be constantly on our guard against sacramental theories which are divorced from spiritual experience.

The lack of a rigid uniformity in the sequence of the rites of initiation in the New Testament, which we have observed, should warn us against a too rigid scheme. But this line of thought is often pursued more radically, to call in question the whole idea of special sacraments. Because the Spirit is not bound by *any* channel, ought we to abandon *all* particular channels, or to regard them as permissible if found useful, rather than as integral to the life of the Church?

Two observations I will allow myself on this large and important topic:

(i) We should look more carefully at our sacramental theory and practice in the light of the theology of *personal correspondence* between God and man, God's act and man's response, as expressed for example by Brunner in *The Divine-Human Encounter;* for it is along this line that there is hope of a sound theology of the sacraments. Needless to say, Brunner is far from making *experience* the test of all things.

[18] In *Theology,* May, 1946.

(ii) A closer attention to the Scriptures might perhaps enable us to make use of a criterion of Mason's more effectively than he does himself. He wrote: "While the Wind of God 'bloweth where it listeth', it is revealed in Scripture as listing to blow in this particular way . . . ".[19]

V

A point of great contemporay importance for the ecumenical movement and all the Churches connected with it arises from these discussions. The appeal of Gregory Dix is back behind medievalism to the early centuries, back indeed to the 'theological direction of the Apostolic age".[20] "The appeal of the Anglican Church is to Scripture as interpreted by the primitive Church and sound learning".[21]

Recognizing that major reforms may take a generation or more, it is vital ~~for~~ us to ask: is this appeal valid? In what sense are we bound by the tradition of the early centuries, or even by Scripture? Do we not all pay lip-service to the New Testament as the norm of subsequent development, and in fact follow the traditions in which we have been reared?

One of the very hopeful features of current theological discussion appears to me to be the recovered emphasis on the Bible, and (as I have heard A. G. Hebert say), it is upon this that we should concentrate in our growing together, in the hope of the ultimate healing of our divisions.

VI

Some final brief words may perhaps be permitted on the pastoral questions involved.

I find the case for restoring the primitive oneness of the baptismal rite unanswerable. For many in the Free Churches this will involve a new scrutiny of present practice—indeed such a scrutiny of our attitudes towards sacraments has been in process for some time, and was certainly overdue. I have been astonished recently at the number of Free Church people with whom I have discussed this matter, even among those who have professed strong convictions about the New Testament as their only guide to such matters, who have never even noticed that there is a problem about the laying on of hands in connection with Baptism!

The Eastern Church has retained the unity of the initiatory rite, but it is applied in its wholeness to infants: *i.e.* infants are immersed in water; chrism, the Eastern equivalent of the laying on of hands, is administered; and they are admitted to first Communion. Is that the way forward in the West? Or ought the Church of England,

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 451.
[20] *Op. cit.*, p. 7.
[21] *Theology*, January, 1948, p. 11.

for example, to look to a restoration of the primitive unity by postponing Baptism and uniting it with Confirmation at an age when there can be some personal faith on the part of the recipient and when first Communion can be meaningful?

The Baptismal Reform Movement (with a membership of over five hundred Anglican Clergy, including several Bishops) has adopted as one of its main objects the abolition of *indiscriminate* Infant Baptism (*i.e.* the Baptism of infants from families which have no connection with the Church and whose parents give no indication that they intend to give their children a Christian upbringing). H. G. Blomfield, Vicar of Newquay and Secretary of the Movement, has suggested[22] that children of non-communicant parents should not be baptized, but should be admitted to a revived Catechumenate.

Such a reform would be almost a revolution in the Church of England. But even more revolutionary would be the adoption of a suggestion put forward by Dr. Kirk, the Bishop of Oxford[23], that "instead of being baptized in infancy a child might at that stage be admitted as a catechumen, or 'learner'; and then after a period of instruction and when 'years of discretion' are reached, be baptized and confirmed, and admitted to communion". This suggestion would apply to *all* children, whether of non-communicant parents or of parents who are active and regular communicant members of the Church.

It is surely of great significance that this suggestion should be made by so responsible and scholarly a Bishop. It may be a long time before such a radical reform gains enough support to be carried through, but it is undeniable that it would remove at one stroke many of the theological riddles about the relation between Baptism and Confirmation, as it would do away with some of the sadly unsatisfactory features of Infant Baptism as at present practised in many of the Churches of Christendom.

[22] In *Theology*, April, 1947.

[23] Not in a learned lecture to an audience of theologians, but in his Diocesan Magazine, September, 1946.

THE MESSAGE OF P. T. FORSYTH

By H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., D.D.

Dr. Cave has told us that he was still a schoolboy when he met Peter Taylor Forsyth for the first time. That was the way with me, too. I entered Hackney College at eighteen, two years before the first World War. Forsyth was at the peak of his power. I must not embark on reminiscence, but I must pay a tribute to a supremely great teacher to whom I owe more than I can put into language. His books I have read and re-read; yet precious as they are, and would be even if I had never known their author, their chief value to me is that they so easily bring back memories of the living voice. I wish I could tell others what it was like to sit at his feet. If only I had the literary art to take them back forty years and set them down in the lecture-room of Hackney College! But if I cannot take them to Forsyth, at least I can stand aside and let Forsyth come to them. As Dr. Cave said, Forsyth's message speaks "to our estate". It is a contemporary word that has not been outmoded by the march of tragic events or drowned in the strident debate of later theologians. Forsyth ranged widely over the field of Christian dogmatics, and wrote many books. Here I confine myself to one.

I

During the 1914-18 War, Forsyth wrote a book to which he gave the unusual title—*The Justification of God: Lectures for War-Time on a Christian Theology*. Technically, it is not one of his best books, yet it is entirely characteristic of him. I choose it for exposition here not only because it contains the essence of Forsyth's message—the smallest things he wrote do that—but because it focuses that message on a situation which is still our situation, and on a problem which for many people today is the most intractable of all problems that confront our Christian faith. There are questions Christians were asking in the first World War that they are asking still. "If God is good, why does He permit wars? Why did He allow Hitler to lay Europe waste? What has Christianity to say to a civilization that is dying before our eyes?". We can add another: "Is God baffled, as we are baffled, by the atom bomb with its frightful potentialities?".

Now what these questions amount to is a demand that the Church shall justify God to man. And the demand can be met only if the Church's Gospel is nothing less than God's own self-justification.

Forsyth is scornful of

> machine-made appeals to the Church to be getting ready to handle the situation when the war is over. As if a Church which could not prevent its coming about would have much effect on the awful situation when it is done: If the Churches so little gauged the civilization which they had allowed to grow up, and which carried the war in its womb, are they more likely to grasp the case when the moral confusion is worse?

The churches have succumbed to the modern heresy of humanism. "Everything has come to turn on man's welfare instead of God's worship, on man with God to help him and not on God with man to wait upon Him". Now Christ does indeed mean 'God for us', but "whereas, we begin with 'God for us' by His grace, we end with 'We for God' by our faith". And in any case the function of the Church in war-time is more than ambulance work—the comforting of bereaved hearts. This is indeed a very precious thing, but even here she will fail unless the assurance she has to impart comes from the Gospel which speaks of a racial salvation in which God has dealt with evil once for all and with decisive effect.

Since Forsyth's day, humanism has been often and heavily belaboured. And many have felt that the modern reaction against humanism has gone too far, even to the point of making us forget the great services it has rendered to our civilization. Forsyth, however, was not one-sided in his estimate of it. From him humanism received full credit for the positive values it enshrined. It was a valuable adornment of the temple of humanity, but as a foundation it was a menace. And, remember, it did not need even one World War to open Forsyth's eyes to the weakness of a humanistic theology. In every book he wrote, even in the earliest, he prophesies the collapse of a faith that has set more store by the lily work than by the pillar. It is the danger that peculiarly besets the churches in an age of democratic enthusiasms and social sympathies. In the religion of his day, Forsyth found that the Gospel of the divine Fatherhood had been debased by sentimentality, and a cult of a winsome, wooing Jesus Who had forgotten to be stern. Before the first World War broke out he had prophesied the collapse of this religion and of the faith it had nurtured. And, the war having come, he notes that

> such a habit of mind, now that the lid is off hell, is suddenly struck from its only perch, feels taken in, and asks if such a world as we see can be the means to a loving end. And in its shock it can find no theodicy in the course of history, no conduct of things by God worthy of God—worthy of its kind of God, Whose Cross was but a kindly boon to crippled men, and not chiefly an honour done to the Holy Name, and the foundation of the Holy Realm.

Humanism, then, is all very well, but it is too fragile. It does not survive the breaking of the nations. Neither does a faith which draws its sustenance from humanistic optimism rather than from the authentic Gospel. By many of his contemporaries, Forsyth himself was supposed to be a setter-forth of an antiquated, narrow orthodoxy.

> When we use the only language that fits the moral case of mankind, the language of the New Testament, we are supposed by very many who should know better to be discussing theses and holding a brief for some system of theology, instead of handling the last moral powers of heaven and earth, and setting out the final relations of God's conscience and man's.

Today we have learned better than that. Your Edwardian Nonconformist minister, who endeared himself to his congregation as a big, brotherly fellow by having "no use for theology", would now merely write himself down as a charlatan and an ass.

The fact is, of course, that we can have a true theology or a false one, but we cannot preach at all without preaching theology. All our sermons present to men a certain conception of God and His dealings with men. Our faith implies it. So do the consolations we try to give to the distressed. And Forsyth was attacking the pitifully inadequate theology which, long before the first World War, was weakening the life of the Church. In a time of world crisis God's Truth, God's Gospel, is our only resource. Our theology, that is to say, must be *theocentric*. What that meant for Forsyth we will see in a moment. Meanwhile, let us try to see the world-situation as he saw it—for, remember, it is essentially the same world-situation as that to which our preaching must be addressed. In many respects it has worsened—inevitably. Yet only an allusion here and there to a Germany already apostate but not yet sunk in Nazi bestiality reminds us that Forsyth is dealing with that situation in its earlier phases. Some of us may recall that well before the "Cease Fire" sounded in 1918 we were girding ourselves to build a better world. Reconstruction was the word of power. There were to be homes for heroes in a world made safe for democracy and kept at peace by the League of Nations. Forsyth did not share those dreams. While others thought only of making the world safe for democracy, he asked how democracy was to be made safe for the world. When they talked of international peace through democratic control of diplomacy he was scornful. "Democratic control! Who or what is controlling or instructing the democracy?" Forsyth was a good democrat, but of the school of Calvin rather than Rousseau. He insisted that the last problem of society is the problem of authority; that nothing is settled till that is settled; and that the world-authority can only be that moral absolute that regenerates and settles the soul for ever.

A religion great enough to speak God's Word in an hour of crisis must have at its heart a Gospel of a world overcome and redeemed by a God Whose love can be trusted because His first concern is for His own holiness. This was a hard saying for the men of Forsyth's day. As for ourselves, even after the experience of two World Wars and the dreary moral waste between them, we do not find it easy to understand Forsyth here. What is this "holiness of God" that runs like a scarlet thread all through his writings?

II

We come nearest to understanding Forsyth if we approach as he did by way of the doctrine of Atonement. We note first of all the stress on Atonement as God's own act. It was God Who was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. It was God Who so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son. This is said once and for all against every travesty of the truth that would make it appear that Christ died to make God gracious unto us or to appease His anger. Yet it will not do to throw overboard the rigid penal theory of Atonement without doing justice to the vital concern of that theory to find an unshakable foundation for justification by faith. There was a finished work effected in the Cross. My salvation and yours is grounded in an act that saved the whole race. God so loved the *world*. It was the lack of this note that made the theology of the day so impotent to speak to the nations or to achieve anything beyond ambulance work. Popular Christianity had made of the Cross a device for the rescue of believers from a doomed world. "Salvation, the Church, the Kingdom, become but the proceeds from a good sale of the wreck of creation". But the Cross is the vindication of the moral order of the universe. More than that, it is its source. "And it is the active principle which slowly brings to book the devices of men, the enterprises of heroes, and the adventures of nations".

The 1914-18 War broke in upon the beginnings of the Ecumenical Movement.

> As religion seemed to be growing more ashamed than ever before of its divisions, civilization, always prone to mock the disunion of the Churches it has demoralized, cuts across its path with a strife such as the world has never seen.

Now the Churches were coming together because they believed that in Christ humanity was one, and that it was a part of their mission to the world to make this racial unity visible to men. And the fundamental unity of the race had inspired secular idealism, with its dreams of the Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World. But is man a unity? War always brings that question to the surface. And humanism cannot answer it.

War brings its own rough answer, which is that mankind is at least an actual unity. Modern war means world-war, and world-war leads to world-chaos. There can be in the end no neutrality, no isolationism, no contracting out of disaster. But perhaps this unity in disaster is itself a pointer to a deeper unity. If men are indeed members one of another then may we not hope and work for the day when at last they shall have learned this lesson and the things that belong to world-peace? Yet where, outside the Christian revelation, do we find a foundation for a faith in the unity of the race?

Now the question about the unity of the race resolves itself into another: "Is there a moral order, or is the only curb on individual egoism a national egoism which makes a race its own god, and patriotism the sole religion?". It is no use looking to common human sympathies to found and preserve the unity of the race. "Does the touch of nature make the whole world kin when we come to business and interests cross?". Civilization does not unify; nor does 'Progress'; nor does 'Planning'. "War, which is the triumph of plan, is moral anarchy. Nothing is so efficient as a bomb". And our generation, which has heard the explosion of the first atomic bomb and has seen the ideologies shut the gates of mercy on mankind, can only underline Forsyth's words—"As we become civilized, we grow in power over everything but ourselves. We grow in everything but power to control our power over everything".

No, we get no confidence from our survey of the past or from speculation about the future. We find no sure foundation for our faith anywhere in ourselves or in the history of our race or in the achievements of our civilization. Yet there is a clue, as we have seen. There is unity in misery. "War is sin's apocalypse. It reveals the greatness and awfulness of evil". It helps us to be rid of the shallow religion that cannot understand the Gospel because it has never bottomed the depth of that mystery of iniquity with which the Gospel has to do. A religion can be universal in its range and message only when it is a religion of moral redemption.

That a shallow faith should share the fate of the things that are shaken need not surprise us.

> In the seeming failure of a God of order we are cast upon a God of crisis, Who is God most chiefly in the tragedy of things, and from the nettle of perdition plucks the flower of salvation. . . . Our faith did not rise from the order of the world; the world's convulsion, therefore, need not destroy it. Rather it arose from the sharpest crisis, the greatest war, the deadliest death, and the deepest grave the world ever knew—in Christ's Cross.

Crisis—how that word keeps coming in! It is true that the

journalists have cheapened it, but we must rescue it. For Christian theology is a Theology of Crisis, essentially and inevitably. Karl Barth did not invent the phrase or the thing. It is not a modern pathological development of Christian thinking, compact of the disillusionment and despair of the defeated nations and the bewilderment and frustration of the victors. It is merely an attempt to take seriously what God is saying in His Gospel, and reiterating in the tragedies of a world in flames—that the strategy of redemption is not evolutionary progress but judgment and crisis. The fires of the burning cities light up the Cross. It is there, on the Cross, that we shall find the unity of the race and the pledge of its final redemption. It is *there,* and there alone, that we shall find God justifying Himself. What settles and secures our faith is no philosophy of history that traces a visible Providence in events, still less a speculative estimate of the direction in which civilization is moving, but a divine redemption that focuses all history in the history of one people, Israel, and fulfils the destiny of that people in one Man dying on a Cross and rising from the dead.

The Cross is a greater tragedy than all the wars in history. That sounds, Forsyth admits, extravagant and extreme. Yet it is the truth. What is more, it is the truth that grounds all our faith and hope. Evil has already done its worst against God and has been defeated.

Now what is called the "classic" theory of the Atonement—that on the Cross God in Christ worsted the Devil and all his principalities and powers—has made a powerful appeal to our generation, which is by no means as ready as its immediate predecessors to dismiss belief in a personal evil power as mere superstition unworthy of credence in a scientific age. That "classic" theory has its own strength and value, as well as a sure foundation in the New Testament. But there is more than this in Forsyth's thought concerning "the cruciality of the Cross". So let us follow Forsyth as he asks and answers the question—why does the Cross of Christ (and His Resurrection, which must not be separated from it) guarantee and found a faith victorious even in a world like ours and over it? In other words, what is the Gospel of the Cross?

III

Shall we say that the Cross speaks to us of a divine suffering that redeems? We may indeed say this, yet could not say even this unless we could say far more. Suffering, it is clear, is not itself redemptive. In itself it is sheer evil. It may chasten, but it may also harden. And though it purifies some, it degrades others. What its effect may be in a particular case depends upon the sufferer's attitude to his pain and to those who inflict it. Even if we say that suffering is redemptive only when voluntarily borne,

i.e. when it is in the fullest sense sacrifice, we are brought up short by the recollection that idealism and sacrifice have been too often prostituted by the powers of evil—as the sacrifice of young Germans was prostituted by Hitler—to justify us in ascribing to sacrifice *per se* any redemptive quality. And even if we then remind ourselves that we are speaking of divine sacrifice, and the free self-surrender of divine love in Christ, we have not said nearly enough. When and where does this divine love triumph? Must it wait in patience until our hard hearts have been broken by the sad spectacle of a crucified Lord? If so we have no *Gospel* but only a wistful hope that since God is God, His love will outlast our hate, and His pity our folly and rebellion. A deep question forces itself on us here. What makes God to be God? Is it His love? Is love, even the divine love, enough?

We make an advance towards deeper, fuller truth when we see that this sacrifice is for men's sake only because it is first for God's. Love is not enough to save unless it be *holy* love. God's first concern in reconciling us to Himself is to vindicate and satisfy His own holiness. He justifies Himself on the Cross—fully and finally. That is why we may be justified by faith in the Crucified.

What Christ does to save us is not to exhibit the love of God, but to confess and satisfy His holiness. In that Atonement, which is God's justification of Himself, we have more than MacLeod Campbell found. For though it is true that only the Holy One knows how grave sin is, how much the sinner is losing by it, and how great is his need of forgiveness; yet it is also true that only sinners can *repent* of it. Christ did indeed identify Himself with us in our sin and misery, and His offering of a perfect obedience to God from the midst of our tragic bondage, makes our repentance possible and commits us to a like filial obedience in Him. Yet He justifies us before God and our own conscience only because He first justifies God and satisfies His holiness in the one way in which it can be satisfied—by carrying out and bearing the divine judgment on sin.

But are we not back at the old penal theory? Why must holiness be satisfied before love can forgive? Forsyth is emphatic not only in his insistence that it is *God* Who atones, and not Christ Who interposes between us sinners and the divine thunderbolts, but also that there can be no question of playing off divine attributes against one another.

Divine love does not come in to mollify divine holiness. The love that saves us is *grace,* the holy God in action, defending, vindicating, and securing for ever the moral order of His creation against the sin that strikes at its foundation. Salvation is not mere salvage; it is a new creation in which God puts forth the plenitude of His omnipotence. For when we speak of holiness we speak

of what makes God most truly God—that unchanging moral dynamic that creates and sustains the world, that judges and saves it, and fulfils all things in Christ.

We are not saved unless the Creator saves us. This was the truth that the Church defended against Gnosticism and Arianism. The God of love must be the God of omnipotence too. Yet even omnipotence is not omnipotent unless it be holy. "Mine is an unchanging love". How do we know that, so as to be able to trust it for ever? Only if the love be that of the holy God, Who will be satisfied with nothing less than the hallowing of all things in the hallowing of His Name on Calvary. What has to be satisfied is conscience, and not merely the affections. The awakened and repentant sinner cannot be assured of his justification except as it is brought home to his conscience and confessed there. And holiness, we may say with Forsyth, is the conscience of God. Here at last is the moral absolute, the rock foundation of the universe. Here is the foundation for our faith in time of war and in the twilight of civilization.

> If the greatest act in the world, the greatest crime there, became, by the moral, the holy victory of the Son of God, the source not only of endless blessings to man but of the perfect satisfaction and delight to the holy God, then there is no crime, not even this war, that is outside His control or impossible for His purpose.

The faith that fortifies us is not capable of demonstration, else it would not be faith at all. Yet admitting that, we often forget it, and look for support where none is to be found. It is only too easy to mistake for genuine faith the genial confidence that God's in His heaven because all's right with our world. When our world is all wrong, however—what then? What happens to this easy faith when the river of 'progress' loses its way in the insatiable sands and our castles of hope tumble into ruins? But let Forsyth have the last word here:—

> With such a Europe, with its negligence of God and His righteousness, with the levity even of the religious mind, the unsettling thing would be if there were no catastrophe. The disquieting would be if there were no judgment on materialist civilizations, poor pieties, and shallow politics, and gorgeous getting on, were there no rectification of things by a tremendous surgery, no dreadful incision of the deadly growth that gathers within the nations that forget God. . . .
>
> Faith is more than an individual calm; it is the Church's collective confidence on the scale of the world for the destiny of the world. The evil world will not win at last, because it failed to win at the only time it ever could. It is a vanquished world where men play their devilries. Christ has overcome it. It can make tribulation, but desolation it can never make.

THE RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CINEMA

By Vernon Sproxton

'It wouldn't have happened if Dick Barton had been there'. This was the reaction of a Primary scholar in one of our Sunday Schools to the story of the Passion. It is a striking example of the manner in which contemporary popular entertainment is providing people with a new *iconology*, a fantastic world of personalities and saga which derives from cartoons, radio, and screen. This is, of course, not a new phenomenon, for all societies, primitive and 'civilized', produce their own symbolism of a supra-historical world. In the Middle Ages, however, it had a foundation in reality. Medieval man could contemplate the existence of the saints in heaven with as much ease as modern man can imagine the characters of "Much Binding in the Marsh". But his *iconology* was charged with power, for he believed the saints took an interest in the day to day affairs of men. Ordinary activities were pregnant with symbolic meaning, and even classical myths were expounded in support of the medieval Christian synthesis. A mason bound love (lime) and earthly toil (sand) by the Spirit of God (water), whilst the clerk realized that the story of Ulysses represented the struggle of the Christian against temptation[1].

Whatever may be said about the arid and grotesque medieval symbolism, it did at least try to give meaning to existence. It was shattered by the Reformation's iconoclasm, which was intolerant of the valid elements in both catholicism and the Renaissance. This was tragic, for it meant that there was no hope of setting the new vitality of the Renaissance, against which the Reformation was ultimately powerless, in its proper context.

> We all know how, in large things as in small, in general as well as in particular, piece after piece collapsed, and how the alarming impoverishment of symbolism that is now the condition of our life came about. *The power of the Church has gone with the loss of symbolism,* too—a fortress that has been robbed of its bastions and casemates, a house whose walls have been plucked away, that is exposed to all the winds of the world and all dangers[2].

From the Reformation until now, the vitalities of cultural movements have had their origin in and have derived their symbolism from the Renaissance. The 17th century did see a return to Biblical

[1] *Cf.* H. O. Taylor, *The Medieval Mind,* Vol. II.
[2] C. J. Jung, *The Integration of Personality,* p. 61. My italics.

mythology, but it was limited, ephemeral; and Milton, the most significant example of it, contains a large amount of classicism. In the 18th and 19th centuries, literature provided, both by its characters and its great figures, for man's need of some *other world*. Today, Christian symbolism no longer penetrates into our ordinary life. It has even disappeared from amongst Christians, at least the average baptismal register would so indicate. What symbolism there is is provided by trash[3], which has its origin in the more vulgar elements of the Renaissance and the romanticism of Rousseau.

Of the various media which communicate the new symbolism, the cinema is the most potent, for it appeals to the eye and the ear. The fact that 35,000,000 people in Great Britain go to the cinema every week indicates that the cinema satisfies a deep-seated need. One cannot believe that they would go so regularly to see films whose themes are so sickeningly monotonous, unless they got something more than the story. It is true that they escape, and it is not our concern to examine why they need to escape, but to show how the cinema is usurping the function of worship. The purpose of worship is to set our life in the perspective of God's redeeming grace, to be reminded of the act in which God in Christ relieves the tension between our knowledge of our ideal possibility and our inability to achieve it. In the cinema something similar happens. Vicariously we identify ourselves with the characters on the screen, with their tangled problems and the ultimate resolution of them. The emotional pattern is similar to worship, but the factor by which the tension is relieved is not reality (the grace of God in Christ), but, at best, some fragmentary element of reality, or, at worst, something quite false.

The cinema may, in the present state of social unrest, be serving a useful purpose in spite of its pseudo-redemption. The times are frustrating, especially to the young, and the cinema provides an efficient means for blowing off potentially dangerous energy. Recently a number of 'thug' films have appeared, and they have been successful box-office ventures. In seeing them we have been able to get rid of pent-up energy which might otherwise have been directed at the Government, the wife, or the cat. In this sense the cinema may have a certain cathartic value. But it must immediately be observed that the cinema, whilst permitting people to blow off energy, is also emptying life of positive vitality by providing films which fritter away emotion and will which could be directed to the achievement of something worthwhile. They deflate the emotions without ennobling the character. There are plenty of problems to engage our energy without our having to dissipate it in a world of phantasy, like small boys daily relieving Khartoum in the backyard.

[3] The German *Kitschkultur* gets the best meaning. There seems to be no comprehensive English word to cover cheap novels, films, music, *etc.*

The real struggle is not against phantoms of shadow, but against 'principalities and powers' which are real indeed, and are not forgotten when the lights go on. Greek tragedy at its best, a popular entertainment, was able to achieve a proper *catharsis* of the emotions and at the same time reveal real and ultimate issues. But it is just these issues which are obscured in contemporary films. No one can see *Œdipus Rex* without experiencing something of the sense of guilt, but it is hard to find a film in which a similar experience is possible[4].

If Christian worship is focused on the redeeming activity of God, in what point is the pseudo-worship of the cinema centred? This is a difficult question to treat shortly, but an examination of the theme of films will reveal a number of false-christs about which such worship is orientated. When any false, or partially true, element in history is idolized as the solution of man's ultimate problems, it becomes a false-christ. The films are typical of the false-christology of modern culture generally.

(*a*) The cinema was quick to exploit the myth of scientific progress, for, not only was it the prevailing thought-fashion, but it provided a wealth of imaginative cinematic material. Of this type *The Shape of Things to Come* was most characteristic, but it was preceded and followed by many inferior films which held up science as the solution to man's problems. Time was necessary to perfect new techniques of progress. History contained within itself the means of its own fulfilment, a fulfilment usually identified by a profusion of chromium-concrete structures! It was merely a matter of wisely manipulating the material resources of the world. Its error was the assumption that wisdom resided in the technique of manipulation.

(*b*) Whilst the science myth was in vogue another false-christ appeared, and claimed to overcome all the anxieties of life. This was psychiatry. The German *Cabinet of Caligari*, 1919, the first full-length treatment of schizophrenia raised the problem, but many others followed, showing the psychiatrist, a completely adjusted person, using his art to relieve the tensions (sometimes ultimate moral tensions) of his patient. Thus, what is a valid, partially redemptive, technique became the instrument of total redemption. *Mine Own Executioner*, 1947, has called the bluff of this pretension by describing the life of a lay-analyst who, though he can solve some of his patient's problems, cannot cope with his own, and stands in real need of redemption.

(*c*) American soil is not fertile for the growth of radical social philosophies, and so Russia has had to provide an idolized social

[4] The sense of guilt does appear in some continental films: *Day of Wrath, Shoeshine, Quai des Brumes, Frenzy*, and one or two American films, *e.g. Scarlet Street*.

technique which claims to have the formula for bringing about human well-being. This was done by *Potemkin* (banned here for a while) and many others, but the American *Grapes of Wrath* and our *They Came To a City* were a very pale pink in comparison. They have not been taken seriously. This may indicate our fundamental level-headedness, but is more likely to be a sign of our preoccupation with other idols !

(*d*) Films preaching the foregoing false-christs are few compared with the bulk of feature films produced annually, 500 or more. Of these, the majority deify the erotic element of human existence, and make all else subserve it, allowing the emotional relationship with the other person (it is rarely more) to become the regulating factor which relieves life's tensions and overcomes its anxieties. This is the ultimate idolization of *eros*, even though in so doing *eros* is vulgarized in the process[5].

(*e*) The remaining films may be classified as 'justification by success'. The success is usually interpreted in worldly terms, represented by the achievement of personal power over other people, or the arrogation of material gain or recognition. This is one of the most corrupting elements in modern cinema for, whereas, from the Christian point of view, the other idols are partially true insights into the nature of reality, this is false. But neither the critics nor the censors recognize that this is just as immoral as eroticism. Our myopia in this respect is one of the legacies of Puritanism !

Despite the large amount of trash, there have always been a few films which have tried to take a responsible attitude to human problems, and recently there has been a marked emphasis on man 'as his own greatest problem'. This developed during the war when the cameras were turned on John Smith, into whose life a new vitality had come and whose genuine heroism made the toughest of the American stars seem very weak indeed. This 'documentary approach' to the average man had a stimulating effect on British films and, when the war ended, and the immediate source of inspiration disappeared, a number of first-rate films about ordinary problems were made. They treated of the human dilemma, but without reference to the false stock-answers. They posed the question: why is it that, when heredity and environment have been considered, man still seems to have something radically wrong at the very centre of his being?[6] They did not answer the question, but they served a useful prophetic function in challenging man's optimism about himself.

Unfortunately, however, the examination of human problems is at present being frustrated by the technique which helped to expose

[5] *Cf.* R. G. Collingwood, *The Principles of Art*, 38-40. Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, Vol. I.

[6] *Brief Encounter, Temptation Harbour, The Brothers*, are examples.

them, the documentary approach. Though a screenful of people recognizable as our fellows is to be preferred to the painted dolls of Hollywood, it does not follow that a film is nearer the heart of reality because it uses familiar situations and symbols. If this were so *Hamlet* would have nothing to say to us. The substitution of a prefab. for a mansion will not get us nearer the truth, unless such a treatment is informed by a profound and imaginative understanding of ultimate human problems. Much more is needed than a well-photographed account of British domestic life if this element of the British cinema is to develop properly.

From this discussion two questions of real urgency emerge. Both call for the serious thought of theologians, ministers, and laity.

1. Contemporary mythology, even for Christians, is not provided by the Church. The Chinstraps, the Janes, the Sinatras now inhabit the minds of a very large section of the community, and replace the saints, apostles and patriarchs. The *epic* of Dick Barton has replaced the *epic* of our Redemption, which was once familiar to all. Though values do not depend on their symbols, history seems to prove that belief in values disappears after the removal of the symbols. The grin of the cat in *Alice in Wonderland* did not persist indefinitely after the cat had gone! The false-worship of false-christs may satisfy a community from which the eternal dimension has disappeared, but leaves the ultimate problems unresolved.

How does this situation affect a Church which has neither symbolism, nor coherent drama, as it plans its strategy of evangelism? If, as Dr. Micklem has reminded us[7], our Church depends on an intelligent and educated laity, how can we reach a generation of image-worshippers, whose culture is in picture-language?[8] Will the present structure of our worship be able to cope? Clearly this is a problem, if only to those who have produced equally ineffective alternatives, such as religious films.

2. Church and State together must face the old problem of the relation of cultural to political freedom. The Marxists have seen the problem, and have adopted radical and crude measures to cope with it by suppressing all art which does not 'toe the party line'. This may be a betrayal of a fundamental freedom, but it is surely absurd to think that cultural and political life can be separated. The people have elected to undergo a revolution in our political life, yet the most potent forces of opinion are both morally and politically corrupting, not only in their erotic exhibitionism, but in the idealization of a bourgeoise society described in the majority of American

[7] In *Congregationalism and the Church Catholic* (Independent Press, 2s.), p. 29.

[8] Roman Catholic countries, as far as can be seen, have a lower cinema ratio than Protestant countries. America, with a proportionately bigger R.C. community, has a proportionately lower cinema ratio than Britain.

films. Moreover, it is well to remember that the British notion of cultural freedom was developed in a period which assumed the classical-christian view of man. Would Milton have argued so eloquently for the freedom of the Press in an age of *The Daily Mirror, The News of the World,* and *Fun and Fancy Free,* and *Forever Amber*?

The State penalizes employers when they expose men and women to the dangers of silicosis, *etc.*, but permits spiritually and morally disintegrating factors, though in principle, by the index of proscribed books and the censor, it naïvely claims some responsibility for morals. Plato tried to face this issue in *The Republic*[9]. He saw that continuous exposure to trash would lead his guardian to 'waste away his spirit and cut out the sinews of his soul'. Trash militated against the private and public good. But who is to say what the good life is? This gives poignance to the present discussions of Natural Law[10]. Freedom surely does not mean licence to corrupt. It remains the task of the Church, both in thought and political action, to tackle this problem vigorously, to see if there is not a *via media* between the Marxist and ultra-liberal solutions; otherwise the cinema may become, like the Roman Circus, an epiphenomenon of a decaying civilization.

[9] Book 3.
[10] *Cf.* Whitehouse, *Natural Law, A Reconsideration* (S.C.M.).

A good deal is written in popular books and articles about telepathy, but *Telepathy and Medical Psychology* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is a strictly scientific treatment of the subject. The author, Dr. Jan Ehrenwald, is a highly qualified psychiatrist, who was driven out of his own country by the Nazis and in 1939 came to this country, where he has held responsible positions. In this book he carefully weighs the evidence for the existence of telepathy, estimates its clinical value, and suggests its bearing upon conceptions of personality. The book will be of value chiefly to professional psychologists, but it can be recommended to others who are prepared to make a serious study of the subject.

Dr. Elton Trueblood says that the theme of his book, *Foundations of Civilisation* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 7s. 6d.), is that the reconstruction of our world is not primarily a problem in engineering or politics, but the underlying task is to recover the sense of moral order. The essential moral values are, he believes, embodied in the Ten Commandments, and his book is a well-argued plea for their relevance to modern life. He writes vigorously and there is much that stimulates the mind.

L. J. Tizard.

OUR VILLAGE CHURCHES: INDEPENDENCY, GROUPING, OR ——?

By H. F. Leatherland, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.

At the present time there is a lively interest in rural problems. More and more people are visiting the country, reading well-informed books about it, and expressing their concern to preserve its amenities. The country has acquired a new recognition, a new status, and a new importance. War and post-war conditions have made us see that agriculture and the rural economy are indispensable to our national prosperity. Reaction to excessive urbanization has made us ready to appreciate some of the fundamental things the country has to teach us about neighbourliness and community. And living in the country has lost many of its disadvantages. The pattern of community life has been changed, and is still changing. Improved transport, better housing and sanitation, the advent of electricity and mechanization to the farm, the closer co-operation between applied and experimental science and agriculture, greater educational and cultural facilities, to name but a few of the significant factors, have transformed country life. To this development there is no better guide than F. W. Robertson Scott's *England's Green and Pleasant Land*. In this "Penguin" book, the veteran author reproduces essays he wrote nearly a quarter of a century ago, and adds three chapters which describe the advances and achievements which have been made since their original publication. His conclusion is illuminating, and it has the authority of a lifetime's study of rural conditions.

> What do I believe as I come to an end of my manuscript? That if in rural Britain we continue to advance as far materially, intellectually, and, I will say, spiritually, as we have done in the past twenty-five years, no countryside in the world is likely to become a better place to live in, work in and hope in[1].

It is against this background of change and development that we must see the needs and opportunity of our village churches. The time is opportune for a fresh consideration of their life and witness. I am not suggesting either that as a denomination we are unconcerned about our village churches, or that the churches themselves and their ministers are failing to do effective work. But I am pleading that as a denomination we shall implement the care and concern we feel by widening its scope and making its expression more definite; and that we shall show our appreciation of the country

[1] p. 183.

churches by strengthening their resources and seeking to understand their problems as they face a changing situation.

The Churches are beginning to respond to this revived interest in rural questions. The Anglican "Council for the Church and Countryside" has accredited representatives in every diocese and is doing effective work. The British Council of Churches has undertaken an inquiry into the conditions of church life in rural communities, and its report, *The Land, the People and the Churches,* is a valuable and informative document. Congregationalism should be no less active. Our country churches are an important part of our heritage and fellowship, and we have our obligations to them. They occupy a strategic position in our witness, and we ought to be alive to their opportunity. I believe that as a denomination we are called to give thought and devotion to the revitalizing of our village churches.

What can be done?

1. It would seem, first of all, that we ought to make *an inquiry into the condition of our village churches.*

We need to make and publish a survey which will give the facts about them. Our County Unions have annual reports on the grant-aided churches, but there are others (the independent and the pastorless) of which we seldom hear. We need information which is accessible to all of us about the life and work of our country churches as a whole.

There are churches of our faith and order which seldom have a Congregationalist in their pulpits. There are Congregational churches in which the Communion of the Lord's Supper is a rare occurrence. Are there many such? How many?

To what extent are our village churches vital centres of life and culture in the communities in which they are set? Are they on the tide of this developing fulness of life in the countryside, or do they tend to be in a backwater?

Is the effective youth work, and the effective women's work, in the villages being done in the Church and by its inspiration or outside it? The Young Farmers' Clubs and the Women's Institutes are successful and relevant movements: what part do our people play in them?

We are right to ask these and other questions. A full and accurate survey of the present situation of our village churches is a prerequisite for any sound policy which will aid their revival.

2. The next requirement is *a review of the whole question of the ministry in our village churches.*

At the present time the ministers of our village churches are mainly in two groups. There are men who have come within sight of their retirement, and undertake what is regarded as the less

exacting work of a country pastorate towards the end of their ministry. They supplement their annuities with the small stipend of the village church. And there are the men who wish to enter our ministry on the County Union List A or List B qualification. We frankly and gratefully recognize the splendid service given by most of these brethren. But it is to be regretted that the kind of personnel we have in our country churches should be determined mainly by economic considerations. And it is a deplorable feature of our denominational life that we should virtually have two separate ministries—one for the country and one for the town and city. Yet it is true for the majority of our men, that if their first pastorate is in a village they spend the whole of their ministerial life in country pastorates: and the man who finds himself in urban work seldom has an opportunity (even for a short space) to give himself to the service of a country congregation and to receive the benefits which can undoubtedly come from that kind of experience. In *The Land, the People and the Churches* we read:

> The minister who is today working in a mission in the east end of London may be tomorrow working in the heart of the country. We have not in England denominations which operate only in towns and others which work only in villages. . . . The Churches therefore already possess the machinery by which town and country could be interpreted to each other. . . .[2]

That hardly reflects the situation of contemporary Congregationalism! It is to be hoped that the wise application of the Home Churches Fund and a wider vision of the village ministry will lead to a freer interchange of town and country pastorates.

There are resources for the village ministry which we should do well to explore. For example, how admirable a training-ground work in a country pastorate would be for the missionary candidate. If at the conclusion of his college course the intending District Missionary were to give himself to rural work for a year or two, he would know (and so would the Society!) whether he was likely to prove successful abroad. The qualities needed, especially in the remote village, such as adaptability, patience, and the facility for entering into a more primitive type of society, are precisely those required on the mission field. Nor must it be overlooked that to number among its ministers Mr. So-and-So, who is now in China or the South Seas, would make the fellowship of the village church livingly aware (as probably nothing else could make it aware) of its place in the World Church.

Here is another possibility. Why should not a man of academic bent combine a village pastorate for a few years with work in rural adult and adolescent education (for which there is ample scope and a growing demand) and at the same time pursue his own special line

[2] p. 58.

of study more intensively than the demands of an urban ministry normally allow? Such a practice would recover a valuable part of our tradition, for in former generations the country manse was often a home of scholarship and a seminary of learning. It would raise the standard of scholarship in our ministry: we have few breeding-grounds for scholars. (The Anglican Church is fortunate in its canonries—and it is also interesting to note how many of the contributions to theological journals emanate from country vicarages!) It would give Christian direction to a developing educational service in the country—and we must not forget that new doors may soon open for us in the County Colleges. And at the same time it would refresh our village churches.

I do not wish to give the impression that I regard the village ministry simply as a useful preparation for something else, or as a convenient opportunity which may be exploited in the interests of theology, the town church, the Missionary Society, or a man's own academic predilections. Wherever a man is called to minister, the first charge upon his time and energy is the preaching of the Word and the care of his own people. And to be a minister in a village church is worthwhile in its own right: a man may there endeavour to fulfil his ordination vows, and that is all that finally matters. What I am pleading for is that we shall not recruit the village ministry from too limited a field. There are opportunities in the country pastorate which can only be grasped by the well-equipped and alert man. There is need for the Congregational minister to take his place on the Education Committee of the local authority, on the governing bodies of primary and secondary schools, and in the many activities of the neighbourhood. A village church gets out of the main current of its community life if its minister is never seen in these positions. His Anglican neighbour is always there.

3. My last suggestion is that we shall endeavour to discover *an alternative both to independency and grouping*.

We have neither the men nor the money to provide every church with its own minister. In many places we try to group two or more churches and put them in the care of one minister. The results of this experiment are on the whole disappointing. Our system of grouping does not appear to be popular or satisfactory. Why? In the mind of the countryman the parish has no great significance as an ecclesiastical division, but it often means a great deal to him as a cultural unit. He has parochial interests, friendships and loyalties. When it is mooted that his church should be linked with another Congregational church four or five miles away, in another parish, there is nothing in the sociological pattern of his community which has prepared him for, or predisposed him to, the suggestion. The plan, commended by a County Union Executive, is bound to appear

arbitrary to him, and since he knows that it is simply designed to give economic relief and will probably solve no problems, he is not enthusiastic.

We have, moreover, to reckon with the fact that in many places where we have a number of Congregationalists, we have not the personnel to form a fully organized Congregational church. As things are, we have no option but to try to do so, with the result that we find a proportion of deacons, Sunday School teachers, and other office-bearers who have not the gifts requisite for their work. Many of the difficulties and limitations of our country churches are assignable to this cause. Ought we not in some areas, where local conditions make it possible, to have a Congregational church for the whole district, with one membership roll and one diaconate? For example, in a district which is geographically a unit, we may have at present a relatively strong Congregational church in the market town and several village churches within easy reach of it. The town church has a fully trained minister: one village church may have a semi-retired minister; another a lay-pastor; and the rest are without pastoral oversight. I suggest that in a situation like that we need one church of all the Congregationalists in the district, and to have one diaconate, the majority of whose members would be from the town church and the remainder from the village churches. And let the ministry to that district church be undertaken by a mobile team, consisting of the minister (who would be mainly responsible for the town church, but would in a real sense be the pastor of the larger flock), and assistant (possibly of the type I have suggested), a capable youth worker, a deaconess, and a number of trained and competent lay-preachers. I suggest that such a team—mobile, and tackling the problems of the district as a whole—would do far more effective work than is possible under our present arrangements.

It will be objected that such a scheme as this would never have a chance of success, because of the conservatism and independency of our churches. It is possible to exaggerate the difficulties. Our country churches would be very willing to receive proposals which were the outcome of the Congregational Union's considered policy for their welfare as a whole, as distinct from improvised grouping here and there. They know that unless something is done, and done soon, to change their situation, many of them will be closing down. Even the psychological effect upon a fellowship of twenty-five (or fewer) people, of whom more than half are above fifty years of age, of being incorporated into a large and efficient church, would be beneficial. Above all, it must be remembered that the pattern of community life has prepared the mind of the countryman for the district church and the ministry of the mobile team. The market town is the natural centre of the area it serves; it is the focus of

interest; it promotes a commerce in ideas as well as in goods. In the villages round about it, the medical service is mobile; you may have three doctors and the district nurse working in a dozen villages. The educational service is mobile; the school bus or the school taxi is a securely established institution. The cultural activities, such as the Young Farmers' Clubs and the Women's Institutes, are "district conscious". These developments have prepared the way for some such scheme as the one I have outlined, and there are many places where it could be tried out with the prospect of good success.

I put forward these suggestions because I am convinced that Congregationalism has an opportunity of establishing itself again in the life of our rural communities. But we must be ready to survey their condition, face the facts, adapt ourselves to contemporary needs, and be bold and adventurous in our witness to these times. We ought not to need the reminder that many of our historic churches are in the countryside. Of our three hundred churches which were formed before 1700, at least 60 per cent are in small villages. We ought to be concerned for them, and for all our village churches. The next decade will be critical for many of them. It would be a grave misfortune if Congregationalism were to become wholly an urban manifestation of church life, for there is real need of our way and purpose in the country. Let the Union of England and Wales, and the County Unions, give careful and sympathetic consideration to these matters and frame a sound policy, and a response of enthusiastic welcome and loyal co-operation will be forthcoming from our village churches.

CONTEMPORANEOUS HISTORY

LATEST FROM THE CROMWELL FRONT

By Albert Peel, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.

Historically-minded readers of this journal may remember that some years ago there appeared a notice of the first two volumes of Prof. W. C. Abbott's *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*. Vols. III and IV have now appeared (Harvard & Oxford Presses, 27s. 6d. & 40s.), and the completion of a great task—Prof. Abbott did not live to see publication—deserves record in the periodical of a denomination which counts Cromwell as its "chief of men". The work is a monument of industry: while little new appears in its pages—of which Vol. IV contains over 1,000—never before have all these writings and speeches been gathered together, and Prof. Abbott has placed students of the period for ever in his debt. How closely he has gleaned may be estimated from the fact that his additional bibliography, bringing that of 1929 up to date, includes articles from the *Congregational Quarterly* and the *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*. Perhaps, indeed, too much is included, for not every document which bears the name of a chief executive has come under his personal notice. But that is a good fault, and we would put on record our testimony to a fine example of American scholarship. It shows us Cromwell immersed in infinite detail, continually harassed by financial pressure, struggling against ill-health, ever alert for plots against his government and his life, increasingly embarrassed by the effort to maintain his principles in rapidly changing situations at home and abroad. Prof. Abbott's choice of the commentary of one Ambassador rather than others has no obvious explanation, nor does he stop to stress the close affection between Cromwell and his children as displayed even in official letters. He sees Cromwell, not the dominant figure so often painted, ruling a willing nation, but a man frequently at a loss for his next move, often mistaken, especially in foreign affairs, and relying much on the advice of others.

> He was, perhaps, "a weary Titan struggling towards his goal", but he was often a wrong and always a perplexed Titan.

Indeed, Prof. Abbott concludes that Cromwell was a military dictator whose rule was more distasteful than even the tyranny of the Stuarts had been, and one who was happy in the moment of his death, for his rule had already begun to break down.

It will be clear that the American scholar's verdict will not satisfy Mr. Isaac Foot, or even Mr. Leyton Richards! Nor does it satisfy

us. Indeed, it is disappointing that there is a verdict at all, for Prof. Abbott started out with the intention of being objective. It is perhaps particularly unfortunate that an essay in estimation is included, for it appeared as a magazine article in 1913, was revised for book publication in 1924, and has had several subsequent revisions. The objectivity seems to have diminished volume by volume; in Vol. IV one reads 200 pages before learning that we are dealing with one of the great men of history, so intent is the editor on stressing that Cromwell was an old man, tired and ill, resorting to all manner of subterfuges and procrastinations to maintain his power.

Whence arises this weakness in an otherwise admirable piece of work? It arises from the fact that all history is contemporaneous, and that Abbott is one of those who could escape from the mental climate in which he was working. It is, of course, impossible to do so entirely, but it should not be so obvious that a work is altogether different because the writer lives in 1940 rather than in 1890. This contemporaneity affects Prof. Abbott in two ways.

First is the *obsession with dictatorship*. The fact that the world has known Lenin and Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini, colours his opinion of Cromwell's rule. There is far too little stress on the Protector's efforts to co-operate with Parliament, on his advanced views of toleration, and far too much interpretation of every action as an attempt to maintain personal power. And a writer can't have it both ways: he cannot hold that a ruler relies much on his advisers and at the same time hold that he was an absolute dictator. Whenever Prof. Abbott is constrained to praise Oliver, there is always a "but" to follow, generally an imputation of some motive: nothing is taken at its face value.

Second, and even more important, this work is contemporaneous in that *it comes from a secular age* in which all religion is under a cloud. Prof. Abbott entirely fails to judge Cromwell aright because he never sees that he is a profoundly religious man: indeed the conception that anybody can be sincere in religious belief seems altogether beyond him. Yes, of course, Cromwell wanted to aid the Protestants on the continent of Europe, but—it was really economic advantage he had in mind. Of course, he quoted Scripture and announced the advantages of religious freedom—but the Foreign Ambassadors and others knew that this was just eye-wash.

This really will not do. You cannot measure Everest with a twelve-inch rule, you cannot estimate a man if you banish the dominant thing in his life. If men of a secular age attempt to understand a religious man, they are among those who, measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves with themselves, are not wise. They have nothing to draw with, and the well is deep.

Prof. Abbott finds it hard to do justice even to the death-bed

scene and to the last prayer. His handling of the long speech with which Cromwell opened Parliament in September 1656 is typical. At the end of the speech Cromwell referred to *Psalm* 85, which he had read the previous day. After quoting most of it, he went on:

> Truly I wish that this Psalm . . . might be better written in our hearts, that we may say as David, thou hast done this, and thou hast done that; thou hast pardoned our sins, thou hast taken away our iniquities. Whither can we go to a better God, for he hath done it? It is to him any nation may come in their extremity for the taking away of his wrath. . . . If we can but cry unto him, he will turn and take away our sins. Then let us listen to him, and then consult and meet in Parliament, and ask him counsel, and hear what he saith, "for he will speak peace unto his people". If you be the people of God, and be for the people of God, he will speak peace, and we will not return again to folly, for there is a great deal of grudging in the nation, that we cannot have our horse-races, cock-fightings, and the like. I do not think these are unlawful, but to make them recreations that they will not endure to be abridged of them is folly. Till God hath brought us to this spirit, he will not bear with us. Aye, but he bears with them in France; they are so and so. Have they the gospel as we have? They have seen the sun but a little; we have great lights. If God give you a spirit of reformation, you will preserve this nation from turning again to these fooleries. And what will the end be? Comfort and blessing. Then "mercy and truth shall meet together". There is a great deal of truth among professors, but very little mercy. They are ready to cut the throats of one another; but when we are brought into the right way, we shall be merciful as well as orthodox, and we know who it is that saith, that if a man could speak with the tongues of men and angels, yet want that, he is but sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. Therefore I beseech you in the name of God, set your hearts to this, and if you give your hearts to it, then you will sing Luther's Psalm. That is a rare Psalm for a Christian, and if he set his heart open and can approve it to God, we shall hear him say, "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble". If Pope, and Spaniard, and Devil, and all, set themselves against us, though they should compass us about like bees, as it is in Psalm 118, yet in the name of the Lord we should destroy them. And as it is in this Psalm of Luther's, "we will not fear . . . God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved". [Then he repeats two or three times, "The Lord of Hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge".]
>
> I have done. All that I have to say, is to pray God that he will bless you with his presence, and that he that hath your hearts and mine would shew his presence in the midst of us. I desire you will go together and choose your Speaker.

What would Parliament, or Congress, make of that? What does

Prof. Abbott make of it? Well, that it was a speech that did not make much impression at home and abroad, that the Ambassadors gleaned from it one or two hints about foreign policy, but that it had little effect otherwise. This is the general reaction when at any time Cromwell introduces religion. First the speech savours of a conventicle rather than Parliament (and Prof. Abbott always speaks of a conventicle like a nineteenth-century Anglo-Catholic referring to a "dissenting chapel"); then religion is but used as an expedient, to please the "saints" or as a matter of policy. Cromwell may have wanted to lead European Protestantism against the Pope, but he was more intent on trade in the Baltic and in the Channel, and in maintaining his own position. And so while Prof. Abbott has done students splendid service, his work must be used for its documents, and not for the opinions which reflect so unfortunately the period in which it was done. Nevertheless, it should all be read, for it is good for those of us who are apt to idealize Oliver to see what can be made of him by those so near the warts that they cannot see the face.

The same applies to another American work, Prof. T. J. Wertenbaker's *The Puritan Oligarchy* (Scribners, $5.00), which has the twentieth-century emphasis on economics rather than religion all over it. At a time when some American Congregationalists are prone to laud the Massachusetts Puritans as exponents of religious liberty, it is well to see how black the other side can be painted—Quakers, witches, and all the rest. Prof. Wertenbaker's main theory is substantially sound—the "Bible State" was not a democracy, nor did it believe in toleration: its close association of Church and State, its orthodoxy, its control of education and of morals, were all bound to give way before new discoveries in science and politics—and theology. But his treatment is vitiated by several considerations:

1. While he does good work in showing the effect of trade and commerce on the life of the Colony, he is always inclined to think that economic considerations were more vital than those of religion.
2. He does not differentiate between Plymouth and Massachusetts, between Separatists and Puritans—indeed, he has little understanding of them.
3. He has all the Virginian's jealousy of New England, resenting especially New England's claim to have laid the foundations of freedom and democracy in the United States. There is no room for any champion of freedom and democracy but Thomas Jefferson, who gives T. J. Wertenbaker his Christian names.

English readers, it is to be feared, will not get further than a first chapter filled with mistakes; this will be a pity, for the first chapter is easily the worst; and there are some really good ones, if only they

will not judge the author too quickly. But to learn (first paragraph) that Cumberland is in the West of England, that Henry VIII died in 1543, that Robert Browne "taught school" from 1586 to the end of his life, that Barrow and Greenwood were executed on the wrong dates, and that the returned Marian exiles ("Calvinist missionaries") rejected the Thirty-Nine Articles because they were not Calvinistic—all these are as incorrect as are the understanding and exposition of the teaching of Cartwright and Browne and the early Congregationalists.

Clearly the Virginian Professor was too anxious to begin his onslaught on New England and to arrive at his economics to have the time to investigate matters purely religious.

* * *

History, then, must not be too contemporaneous. Since writing the above article, I have re-read Sir Ernest Barker's *Oliver Cromwell*. Delivered as a lecture in Germany in 1936, *it* is contemporaneous, and could not escape being so; but the growing trees obscure neither the wood nor the heights beyond. Sir Ernest recognizes that Oliver is a dictator, but sees him above all as a man of faith and fervour, and there finds the secret of his greatness. Forgetting that, no man, however learned and however fortified with documents, will ever understand one who was the greatest Englishman of his time and one who should be living at this hour.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN CONGREGATIONALISM

By Richard C. Gilman

I

Like nearly all early American institutions and customs, Congregationalism had its roots in the Old World from whence it came. As a matter of fact, the religious community founded at Plymouth, Massachusetts, in 1620—which is generally considered to be the first 'Congregational' church in America—was in reality part of John Robinson's church at Leyden from which it had emigrated, and until Robinson's death in 1625 they continued to regard him as their pastor even though he remained in Holland. This Leyden church was one of several established in Holland between 1582 and 1616 by earnest English Separatists who sought refuge from the yoke of the Established Church in England, and was in the main composed of members of the Scrooby church in Nottinghamshire who had crossed to Holland in the spring of 1609. After nearly twelve years of exile in a foreign land, they sailed across the Atlantic to the New World to establish an English colony and come again under the protection of their king and country. Early in the winter of 1620 these Pilgrims, as they have been called, landed on the shores of Massachusetts Bay and fittingly enough called their settlement Plymouth after the town in England from which they had sailed.

That first winter was an exceedingly difficult one, and more than half the number of the small band of 102 adventurers were buried beneath the snows in the first few months after their arrival. Although their number was reinforced during the next few years, it was not until 1628 that a second English community was established on the shores of the bay. Between 1628 and 1648 several waves of migrations from England crossed the Atlantic to establish the famous Massachusetts Bay Colony which soon became the largest and most prosperous settlement in the New World. It is estimated that in those twenty years up to thirty thousand people came to Massachusetts Bay to make their new homes.

This Massachusetts Bay Colony, first settled at Salem in 1628 and at Boston in 1630, was peopled largely by the Puritans who retained their allegiance to the Established Church in the mother country and who desired to found a church-state largely on the lines of Calvinist doctrine. At Plymouth the Pilgrims had founded a church democracy in which the people themselves managed their religious affairs without deference to bishops or synods, but the

magistrates of the Bay Colony endeavoured to establish a theocracy modelled on Calvin's plan for Geneva. This New World church-state waxed strong for many years, and as a matter of fact it was not until 1833 that the Congregational Church was completely disestablished in Massachusetts.

From the standpoint of religious freedom and toleration, the record of this early church-state was not a pleasant one. These early Puritans were stern and unrelenting, and maintained strict control over all phases of life within the Colony by the enactment of several laws which carried all the severities of Calvinist teaching and discipline. Heretical doctrines were crushed, many persons were driven from their homes, and four Quakers were hanged on the Boston Common in 1659 for their religious convictions.

With the rapid increase of population during the twenty years of the great migrations, other communities were founded in the New England area as the settlers began to move inland from the shores of the bay. More often than not they named their new towns and villages after places in their homeland, and the English visitor to America will recognize immediately the familiar names of many New England communities. As these new settlers poured into the colony in overwhelming numbers, and with the rapid expansion of the whole area, the strict Calvinist church-state gradually died away and Congregational order with strong Presbyterian overtones became the common church organization. The number of Congregational churches increased rapidly, so that by the close of the 17th century there were about 120 in the New England area.

Other colonies along the eastern seaboard were also founded during the latter half of this century, but these were settled largely by colonists from northern and western Europe—Huguenots from France, Mennonites, Moravians, Lutherans, and Reformed Groups from Germany, and Scottish-Irish Presbyterians from Ulster—who sought new hope and freedom in a new country. These mass migrations of so many different national and religious groups contributed to the complexity of the religious scene in America, a complexity which still exists today. The English migrations had largely ceased by the time of the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, and the principal English settlements in the New World were confined largely to the north-eastern section which has come to be known as New England. The actual population of the colonies increased tenfold in the first half of the 18th century until it had reached 2.5 million by the time of the break with England in 1775. During this same period the number of Congregational churches increased to more than 650, and yet all but 25 of this number were in New England. There in the north-east Congregationalism dug in, established itself more firmly, and came to be identified with the 'New England Way'.

The whole eastern seaboard vibrated with the enthusiasm of the great evangelical revival of the early 18th century, and naturally enough, this movement had a beneficial effect on Congregationalism, as it did on all church life. It is said that in the years between 1740 and 1760, 150 new Congregational churches were founded, most of them in New England. The evangelical movement, often referred to as the 'Great Awakening', was spearheaded by two great English preachers, John Wesley and George Whitefield, while New England had its own native prophet in Jonathan Edwards, an ardent Calvinist, who ranks as one of America's outstanding theologians.

Shortly after 1760 the first rumblings of open discontent with English rule in the colonies began to be heard. At that time the New England colonies contained almost one-third of the total population of the entire eastern coastline, and in New England the Congregationalists were three times as numerous as all the other denominations combined. Certainly they were the most numerous and most influential religious group in the country, and as the idea of open revolt against the mother country grew in the minds of the colonists, it was natural that Congregational leaders and clergy played a prominent rôle in directing the pattern of new American thought. Political preaching became more and more frequent, and some historians have ventured to suggest that the American revolution actually began first in colonial pulpits. During the several years of war the clergy for the most part played an active rôle in one capacity or another, and with the cessation of hostilities in 1783 they aided substantially in the launching of a new government and a new nation. It is interesting to note that in the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention of 1779-80 there were thirteen ministers in the roster of delegates.

The 19th century is marked by at least three important features in the history of Congregationalism in America. First of all was the significant but very disastrous attempted Plan of Union with the Presbyterians, and secondly the break with the Unitarians, both of which had unfortunate results for American Congregationalism. The third and more positive feature of this century was the steady and gradual development of Congregationalism as an integrated, self-conscious force on a more national scale.

The Plan of Union with the Presbyterians, first proposed in 1801, was a fairly simple plan whereby the two groups would co-operate in the establishment of new churches in the rapidly expanding regions just west of the Hudson River in what is now New York state. Here the Scottish-Irish Presbyterians and the English Congregationalists mingled freely, and consequently a scheme for uniform church government and the interchange of ministers was devised by which the local church could choose either a Congregational or Presbyterian form of organization. Because of

the strong Calvinist influences in Congregational thought and practice, among other factors, there was a marked tendency for the local Congregational churches to become Presbyterian in both doctrine and practice. The results for Congregationalism were disastrous, and the denomination has never recovered fully from this loss. It is said that in the first 25 years of the 19th century more than six hundred churches were added to the Presbyterian body, while one prominent historian has said that throughout the several decades of association this Plan of Union transformed over a thousand churches which were by origin and practice Congregational into Presbyterian churches. This loss in numbers alone was disastrous, but even more significant was the fact that it deprived active Congregationalism of a growing edge on the western frontier and a vital claim on the rapidly expanding west.

Another serious event during this same period in the first half of the 19th century was the Unitarian controversy which led to the secession of a large number of important churches from the Congregational fold. In fact, one hundred churches in Massachusetts alone, and 20 of the 25 oldest congregations including the first Pilgrim church at Plymouth, joined together to form the American Unitarian Association in 1825. The two groups continued side by side, often in the same community and with bitter feelings, and Congregationalism was seriously weakened, whereas the Unitarians waxed strong for many years afterward. However, the Unitarian church today is one of the smallest major Protestant denominations, claiming less than 400 churches and 62,000 members, largely in New England.

There was also a more hopeful sign for Congregationalism during the 19th century in the gradual development of a national consciousness which led finally to the calling of the first National Council of Congregational Churches at Oberlin, Ohio, in 1871—just 40 years after the founding of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. Synods and meetings of churches in associations had been held in the Massachusetts Bay Colony nearly 250 years earlier, and during the 18th and 19th centuries numerous state and regional meetings of independent Congregational churches were held. Thus, the convocation of the first truly national council in 1871 culminated a long and gradual development of national consciousness. Congregational churches at that time numbered about 3,000 and extended from coast to coast across the vast expanses of the country.

In the subsequent years National Councils have been held at regular intervals, and the organization of the denomination has paralleled its growth and development. In 1931 the Congregational churches united with the Christian churches, a much smaller denomination which claimed a little over 1,000 churches and 100,000

members at the time of the merger. During the past fifty years frequent and persistent efforts have been made to unite with other denominations similar in faith and polity, but no other major plan has come to fruition. However, a merger with the Evangelical and Reformed Churches is being discussed and in due course Congregationalism may in this way take another forward step in its long record of identification with American life.

II

The history of Christian doctrine in the Congregational churches in America may be said to be a record of gradual emancipation from the severe teachings of Calvinism. It has been noted that in the main Calvinist theology was the doctrine of the early Puritan settlers who established the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and this heritage prevailed in varying intensities until the middle of the 19th century when new emphases on faith and works ushered in an era of religious liberalism which is perhaps the characteristic mark of Congregational doctrine in the United States today. The Westminster Confession had been accepted 'for substance of doctrine' by a synod of Massachusetts churches in 1648, and this served as the document of faith and order in Congregational churches for over 200 years. Its influence gradually weakened in the early 19th century, particularly during the period of the Unitarian controversy which was primarily a liberal reaction against stern Calvinist doctrines. Two statements of faith adopted by Congregationalists in national conventions in 1865 and 1883 reflect vividly the gradual decline of a militant Calvinism, and a recent declaration of faith, the Kansas City Statement, adopted in 1913, is a general affirmation of the liberal evangelical faith which is the mark of Congregational doctrine today.

The doctrine of the Church in American Congregationalism has nearly always been based on the idea of the covenant, and from the beginning the individual churches were covenant churches formed by a group of men and women who covenanted together to worship and to serve God. Although there was some ecclesiastical organization along the lines of a presbytery or a synod as early as 1648, the local churches have consistently maintained their own autonomy and independence. However, for the first 200 years there was little or no wider fellowship of Congregational churches. Although frequent synods and councils were held in various regions, the primary pattern of church organization was that of the autonomous local church with its own elders and presbyters who, with the pastor, managed the affairs of the church. Gradually and informally in the New England colonies there developed local associations of Congregational ministers, entirely on a voluntary basis, and these in turn led to larger colonial or state organizations, the first of which

was formed in the state of Maine in 1827. The meeting at Oberlin in 1871 which officially brought into being the National Council was not the first 'national' meeting of Congregational churches, but it was the normal result of a natural growth which had had its earliest beginnings in the cabin of the Pilgrim ship *Mayflower* where in 1620 the Pilgrim fathers had compacted together for the general good of the entire colony. The 1871 meetings actually grew out of a meeting held the previous year in Chicago where representatives from all sections of the country had gathered to observe the 250th anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth.

The National Council has increased in size and in function during the past 75 years, but the local church still remains autonomous and is the final arbiter of all questions relating to its own life and activity. Within the framework of the Council there have developed certain societies and commissions which are entrusted with leadership and administration in certain areas of denominational activity. In addition to the several business committees to carry on the routine work of the Council, there are also the following commissions which are charged with the development of the denominational programmes in specific areas: the Council for Social Action, the Commission on Evangelism and Devotional Life, the Commission on Inter-church Relations and Christian Unity, the Commission on Stewardship, the Theological Commission, the Commission on the Ministry, and the principal missionary agencies.

Although the size and offices of the National Council through its many committees and divisions may seem to be overbearing and authoritative, it is the local church which is the self-sufficient unit of the Congregational order, and the final decision for acceptance or rejection of the actions and recommendations of the National Council resides with the individual congregation. Through its representatives in associations, conferences, and the National Council the local church is able to participate effectively in the wider fellowship and ministry of the Christian Church. This participation is realized in the following way. The local church is a member of an association of Congregational churches, usually within a single county if practicable, and then in turn is also a member of the state conference. There are fifty such conferences in American Congregationalism although they are not all organized along state lines. Representation in the National Council in its biennial meetings is on the basis of the total members in the state conferences or other similar organization, and thus it is the state conference which serves most directly as the intermediary agency between the local church and the National Council. Incidentally, the local church is recognized denominationally by its membership in an association of Congregational churches, and it is these county associations which hold the credentials of the local ministers.

Through delegates appointed by the National Council, the Congregational churches also participate in the work and fellowship of the International Congregational Council, the next meeting of which is to be held in the United States in 1949, the Federal Council of Churches, which is the large Protestant interdenominational body in the United States, and the World Council of churches. Thus the work and witness of Congregationalism in America extends all the way from the local church to the wider fellowship of Christian churches throughout the world.

The overseas missionary work of American Congregationalism is carried on through the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the oldest of the foreign mission boards in the United States, having been originally founded as an interdenominational missionary agency in 1810. For various reasons, including a difference of opinion over the slavery question, the other supporting bodies withdrew so that by the time of the Civil War in 1861, the American Board was primarily Congregational. The Board is now responsible for an overseas parish of nearly 17 million persons, and with about 350 missionaries under life appointment it maintains 13 different missions and 2,278 places of service. Home missionary work within the continental limits of the United States, which is confined largely to rural areas in the south and the west, is supervised by the Board of Home Missions, which also administers the denominational programme of Christian education.

No record of the missionary work of the Congregational churches in the United States would be complete without at least brief mention of the American Missionary Association, which was organized in 1846 and which performed invaluable services in the anti-slavery movement preceding the Civil War. This society represented the anti-slavery crusades in the churches, which were very strong in Congregationalism inasmuch as the great numbers and great strength of the denomination were located in the north. After the war was concluded in 1865 the Missionary Association pioneered in opening schools and colleges for the emancipated Negroes. In the 25 years following the war it founded 15 schools and colleges for Negroes which have a present enrolment of about 6,000 students and which include some of the best institutions for the higher education of Negroes in the south.

Speaking of education, the history of Congregationalism in America has always been marked by a concern for the education of its youth. Less than 10 years after the establishment of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Harvard College was founded in 1636 and since that time it has become the most famous university in America and indeed one of the outstanding educational institutions in the world. More than half the accredited institutions of higher learning in the United States were originally founded by one or another of

the denominations, particularly during the first half of the 19th century, and many are still identified with the parent church. Throughout its long history Congregationalism can be directly linked to the founding of at least 50 colleges in the United States, including some of the oldest and most famous in the country. Although most of these colleges have since become non-denominational in character, there are today some 17 colleges affiliated with the Congregational Christian College Council which attempts to strengthen the bonds between the denomination, the local churches, and the colleges, and to increase the effective service of the colleges to the churches. There is also an increasing emphasis on a higher standard of education in the ministry, and there are at least 11 theological schools and seminaries in the United States which are concerned directly with the training of Congregational ministers. The normal period of training for the ministry is 7 years, 4 years of which are spent in a broad liberal arts programme and 3 years of which are spent in more specialized training in theology and churchmanship.

A brief word should be admitted here in behalf of the strong emphasis on social action which is such a characteristic mark of Congregational faith and practice, as well as of all American church life. This strong social consciousness first found expression in the anti-slavery movements mentioned above, and since that time American churches have continued their campaigns in all areas of social, political, and economic life in an effort to apply the Christian faith to the crucial issues of the day. The work of the Congregational churches in this area is organized through the Council for Social Action which was formed in 1934. The work of this commission is that of research, education, and action in all the problem areas of community life. It is concerned very particularly with the race problem in America, not only with the familiar Negro problem, but also with other areas of racial tensions, including the Japanese-American problem on the west coast which reached its height during the recent war. It has an industrial department to relate the work of the churches to the problems of labour and industry, and its agricultural department is concerned with the social problems of rural areas. In Washington the Council maintains a full-time representative who keeps the denomination and the churches informed on matters of current interest and concern in the Congress and other government departments. Through its international department, the Committee for War Victims and Reconstruction, and the Service Committee, the Council for Social Action has enabled local churches to participate directly in programmes of relief and reconstruction in the stricken areas of the world. Thus the Congregational churches in the United States are brought face to face with the problems of

community and of the world, and through the Council for Social Action they are able to face intelligently these problems and to participate constructively in helpful projects and service.

III

And just where does Congregationalism fit into the religious scene in America today? Before attempting to place Congregationalism in contemporary religious life, it is first both necessary and desirable to characterize generally the nature of the complicated religious scene in the United States at this time. Very briefly the most important characteristics are these. First and foremost, perhaps, would be the complete independence of church and state. Religious freedom to all is emphatically guaranteed in the first article of the Bill of Rights, as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution are known, in the provision that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . .' This complete separation of church and state and the guarantee of religious freedom are directly responsible for the multiplicity of sects and denominations, which is the second characteristic mark of religion in contemporary America. There are in the United States over 250 religious denominations of Christian faith and practice, representing just about every theological position and major national group. Following from this is the third characteristic, the increasing tendency towards a more united Protestantism. This is not necessarily in the forms of mergers and unions—although in the last 20 years well over 15 million Protestant Christians have participated in church unions—but more in areas of interdenominational co-operation and fellowship. And of course, the inevitable concomitant of this increasing co-operation is frequent friction with the Roman Catholic hierarchy, particularly at the top levels. The fourth characteristic of contemporary religion in America is the fact that church membership is actually increasing at a very steady pace. After a slump during the middle thirties, practically all the major denominations are now able to report a rising church membership over and above the normal population increases. Another characteristic of American religious life is the liberalism of Protestant theology in the major denominations, a liberalism which has been described as 'left-wing Protestantism' which expressed itself in the churches' direct participation in the social, political, and economic problems of the day. This is the familiar 'social gospel' which has been called America's unique contribution to Christian thought and experience. Those, then, are some of the important characteristics of religious life in America today, although by no means do they

completely or thoroughly circumscribe the contemporary religious scene.

A few statistics on the size and extent of the Christian churches in America might be appropriate at this point. Roughly speaking, the United States has a total population of something over 140 million people and of this number approximately one-half, or fifty per cent, are normally associated with the Christian faith. Recent figures place the inclusive church membership at about 72 million persons, and of these some 44 million are Protestants, 24 million are Catholics, and 700,000 are Eastern Orthodox. There are also about 4.5 million Jews and an accountable number of Buddhists, International Spiritualists, and other similar groups which are obviously not within the fold of the Christian faith. In the Federal census of 1936 over 250 religious bodies were recorded, but of these only 52 have more than 50,000 members each. These 52 form 97 per cent of the total church membership with the remaining 3 per cent spread out thinly over 204 denominations. The Methodists constitute the largest single group, followed by three large Baptist conventions, the Presbyterians, the Protestant Episcopal Church, two Lutheran groups, the Disciples of Christ, the Congregational Christian Churches, a Lutheran Synod, and so on down the line.

Generally speaking, Congregationalism thus falls within the first ten in respect of size, but it would be fair to say that in leadership and influence it ranks much higher. In the United States today there are nearly 6,000 Congregational Christian churches with a total membership of more than 1,150,000. This membership is spread over all areas of the country and to Porto Rico and Hawaii, although Congregationalism is naturally stronger in some areas than in others. Massachusetts still continues to be the strongest single state for Congregationalism, and New England is still the strongest geographical area in the denomination, although centres of Congregationalism have developed strength and numbers in other sections of the country.

Like most churches in the United States, Congregationalism is growing and increasing in membership, and in 1946 there was a net gain of over 20,000 members. The suggested merger with the Evangelical and Reformed group would add even further to the size and stature of historic Congregationalism and make possible an even more effective witness of Christian faith and practice in America.

CAN WE MAINTAIN THE FREE CHURCH IDEA?

By C. A. Moon

This question has arisen in the mind of one Free Church layman because he sees certain present circumstances as challenging his assumptions as to the nature and implications of the Free Church idea. Although handicapped by lack of philosophical or theological training for the task of presenting the question and the challenge out of which it arises, he feels he must attempt it because, if he understands it aright, important practical issues are involved in the way it is answered.

The very fact that we have Free Church Councils testifies to the existence of the Free Church idea, however inadequately such bodies may express the idea. A Free Church Council is not a federal Church in which, within certain limits, expressed or implied, varieties of doctrine or organization can be permitted. The setting up of any doctrinal limit, however generous, means the equation of churchmanship and creed and relegates matters in which variety is permitted to the realm of the irrelevant. A Free Church Council is rather a confederation based on the belief that there can and should be a unity of the spirit among Christians who may differ in the forms in which they express their faith and fellowship. This belief is based, in turn, on the conception of man as having business in this world of time and space and yet as possessing a life which cannot be fully expressed in thought and action; on the conception of personality as something greater than what can be seen of it in its operations in this world—something greater, therefore, than all that issues from these operations; greater than all social or intellectual formulæ. Thus the individual person operating in this world owes a loyalty as citizen to the State and as church-member to the Church, but citizen and church-member are but manifestations of the personality which cannot be submerged in or subordinated to either Church or State. The whole personality's ultimate duty, to which no other can be preferred, is to the truth and love of God, and only God can measure the fulfilment of that duty. Hence arises the essential Free Church conception—freedom for manifestations of faith and fellowship from the prohibitions and compulsions, favours and ill-will, of the State and also from subjection to monopolistic claims made on behalf of any ecclesiastical or credal form.

But ours is an ethical religion. Man's duty to seek and to serve truth and love in God, though it cannot be subjected to the

judgments of this world or subordinated to the claims of this world, must be pursued within this world and in terms of this world. Thus the freedom claimed for man is an obligation to venture his own manifestations of faith and fellowship: repudiation of monopolistic claims on behalf of any one Church is not a release from the obligation of choice. Freedom does not mean irresponsibility but recognition of an inner duty. Irresponsibility to the spirit may manifest itself in this world as obedience and obedience to the spirit as spontaneity. It is the right and duty of the person to make his own spontaneous responses which justifies the Free Church repudiation of the parochial idea and its conception of a diversity of churches which is more than that of a mere plurality and is certainly not that of a shared monopoly.

If this statement of the Free Church idea is correct, it would seem to be directly challenged by the new conception of town planning which has found favour during the war years and which has been allowed with very little critical examination to proceed to the stage of realization. The new conception of town planning is not concerned merely with correcting abuses and preserving amenities but with the moulding of communities themselves to a preconceived pattern. Alike in proposed new towns and in reconstructed portions of existing cities, it involves the creation of self-contained neighbourhood units and, in many cases, considerable transfers of population. This is not the place to discuss all the aspects of this new idea: the concern here is that the new scope of planning involves not merely the fixing of population densities, the siting of roads and the zoning of road usage, but the inclusion in a prescribed pattern for an area of provision for all its institutions, including places of worship. The placing of such responsibility on a planning authority may easily seem to impose on the authority responsibility for assessing the needs of an area in worshipping facilities in the same way that a licensing authority is called on from time to time to assess its needs in drinking facilities. This seems to be implied in the following passage from the introduction to Sir Patrick Abercrombie's *Greater London Plan*—the prospectus, so to speak, for the enterprises now in hand under the New Towns Act:

> It is estimated that church provision should be made for about ten per cent of the population. The modern church has on the average 500 seats. Assuming this there would be need for ten to fifteen churches in a community of 60,000, or about two to each neighbourhood. Sites should include space for a hall and other rooms. (Page 119).

It is not necessary to suppose that planning authorities would approach the problem in the spirit of cold calculation here suggested. They may adopt the most liberal attitude, recognizing

to the full the claims to continuance of Churches already existing in an area whose replanning is under consideration and offering, in the case of new areas where the population is as yet non-existent and whose desires are therefore hypothetical, sites without stint to whatever ecclesiastical authorities are able and willing to make use of them. Even so, there are two reasons why it may be said that acceptance of a site by a Church is acceptance of a privilege.

The first reason derives from the fact that, other things being equal, the smaller the community, the narrower is the range of institutions, including Churches, it can support, and the higher is the percentage of its population necessary to support a Church. Thus the village, numerically weak through force of circumstances, offers a narrow choice. The choice would often be narrower if numerical weakness were not mitigated by the fact that the village has centuries of common life to fortify it. The planner, horrified at the variegated life of the town, seeks by mechanical means to reproduce village conditions, splitting urban areas into neighbourhood units, each focused on a necessarily restricted group of communal institutions so that these institutions shall be nearer for the people inside the neighbourhood but farther from those outside it. A communion which may, in a given town area, be just strong enough to support a home for its organized life at a point convenient for all its members in that area, will quite probably be too weak to support such a home in each of the neighbourhoods into which the area is to be split. Its continued maintenance of a home will thus depend on its being able to effect an exchange of supporters with those of another communion similarly circumstanced—a concession to the conception both of parochialism and of the irrelevance of denominational diversity.

The second reason for regarding acceptance of a site as acceptance of a privilege is that the planner's pattern is static. He sees his neighbourhoods as issuing from a mould, not as woven from the loom of time. His offer of Church sites to all comers means the granting of a privilege to those who at the time of planning—and now, at a time when the Churches have emerged weakened in human and material resources from the second of two devastating wars—are in a position to avail themselves of it. The freedom he offers is momentary, whereas our claim should be for a continuing freedom—for the same opportunities for initiative and development to be enjoyed by our successors as were enjoyed by our predecessors among whom were the leaders and builders of the Free Churches of today. We cannot foresee when and where new revivals or new unions or new divisions may come, but those who may feel moved to lead or support them should not be forced by the planner into a position of disadvantage compared

with those who represent in the future the institutions which happen now to be able to stake their claim to survival.

If it is contended that this continuing freedom is not of vital importance; if it is considered satisfactory that members of any particular communion should be put at a disadvantage in any area, not by force of circumstances, but by the deliberate act of the planners in the rearrangement of the area; if the future fortunes of denominations are to reflect not the spontaneous responses of people to their claims, but mutual and friendly bargaining between them under the planner's benevolent chairmanship, then the case for diversity of denominations as affording to people that free and real choice which it is their right and duty to exercise and value is surrendered.

This is not a matter of party politics. It is not economic planning, or even town planning in general, that is in question, but a particular kind of town planning. The Free Church idea, as here conceived, is not incompatible with land nationalization so long as the relationship of Church to State is not that of licensee but purely that of lessee; it is not incompatible with an attempt to avoid the worst incoherence which has characterized many urban areas, notably some which have grown up between the wars, so long as the planning of areas is sufficiently generous and elastic to permit of the utmost spontaneity and development within them.

In view of the present hunger for houses, and for land to put them on, it may be said that Churches have no moral right to any redundancy of accommodation: that premises cannot be spared for a peradventure. But Churches now half-empty were filled once and may be filled again. Moreover, planners may well be asked that they should make allowances for freedom of spiritual movement, independent of the omnibus facilities they plan for, at least as liberal as the provision they propose in the way of car parks and the like for those who cannot be satisfied with omnibus facilities for physical movement.

But religion—even organized religion—is not inseparable from building. Even if the planner's case is accepted, it remains to be decided whether Free Churchmen, rather than accept the favours of authority, ought not to be ready to go back to the days of witness and worship in the market place, the hired hall and the cottage parlour.

THESPIS REDEEMED

By H. C. Marsh

The voices of Craig, Pitoeff, Mayerhold and the directors of all the exclusive little theatres of our time have combined to cry: 'Behold, we make all things new'. It is true that impressionist and constructivist settings have provided a note of novelty. Essentially, however, what the advance guard in the theatre has done is to turn its face back to the very beginnings of European drama. Progress cannot be dismissed as pure illusion. Yet the conclusion is inescapable that, whatever enrichment time may bring, whatever deepening of thought, whatever new subtlety of approach, we are forever coming back to the point from which we started.

The roots of drama are in religion—first in paganism, later in Christianity. It began with the dances at primitive nature festivals. Quite early in Christian history the Church hallowed the human instincts to act and to enjoy acting when it created two dramas around the Sacraments. Upon the foundation of simple, comparatively informal events in the life of our Lord the Church erected a towering, breathtaking ritual. The Eucharist is drama, in the full original sense of the word. It comprises a number of significant acts linking human life with its divine source.

In Medieval England the clergy had the task of teaching congregations predominantly illiterate. Words they found an unsatisfactory medium. They wished to find a realistic method of presenting to their people the salient facts about Christ's life. So, at the two great festivals of Easter and Christmas, they produced little dramas portraying the Resurrection and the Birth of Jesus. These liturgical acts were the first Nativity and Passion plays.

The language was at first Latin, but it was early recognized that performances would gain much from the use of the vernacular. The plays grew longer—new incidents were dramatized—audiences multiplied. Inevitably a day came when the Churches were no longer large enough to hold all the people who wished to see the play, and the theatre moved outside, using the great West door as a background.

Once having taken a plunge, ecclesiastical authorities have a habit of meditating upon the merits of the shore. A doubt wormed its way into the minds of several good bishops. These plays, an excellent idea in their original form, and no doubt a source of much blessing, were becoming rather worldly in content. Also their popularity was too considerable. The play was the thing, and it seemed likely that the normal worship of the Church would suffer.

Consequently the clergy were prohibited from taking part in the productions, which passed into the hands of the town guilds. Before long the guilds were regularly presenting, at certain festivals, cycles of plays which covered almost the whole story contained in the Old and New Testaments.

With the drama in the hands of the guilds there was a gradual transition from doctrinal exposition to a concern with human ethics. Mysteries and Miracle plays gave place to Moralities, which portrayed a symbolic human figure against the background of the world and of the Purpose of God. In the greatest of these—*Everyman*—the Morality attains the level of fine art. Of this play and the best of its contemporaries it is true to say that they were often profound attempts to answer the question: 'What is man, that thou art mindful of him?'

The Elizabethan drama can be properly understood only when its family tree is taken into consideration. Shakespeare was more than the peak writer of his period—he represented the culmination of the development of the Morality. What are the tragedies but subtle repetitions of the old question put by the Psalmist? Is it, then, stretching imagination too far to maintain that Shakespearean tragedy was a subtle, delicate, highly sophisticated form of the old Morality? Is it too much of a simplification to describe *Othello* as a Morality about jealousy, *Lear* as a Morality about pride, *Macbeth* as a Morality about ambition, and *Hamlet* as a Morality covering the whole problem of human destiny? I think not.

The theatre of the Restoration was a reaction from the fate which befell the playhouses under Puritan rule. Sobriety, all trace of it, was banished from the boards. The vogue was for highly artificial comedies, in the philosophy of which morality was never more than a mask. The frank and jovial bawdiness of dialogue is infinitely preferable to the smelly innuendo which so often passes for wit on the twentieth century stage, and, witness several recent and notable revivals, the robust phrases sound finely in the ears of a generation dragged up on basic Mayfair. But Restoration comedy was, in England, a new departure, outside the great tradition which reached its crown in Shakespeare.

The return to the great tradition—the fundamentally Christian tradition—began in the Victorian age. Long considered the period of intellectual torpor and of the enthronement of convention, it was yet the great age of the English novel. Most popular among the novelists of the day was a man with an outsize social conscience. My guess is that the theatre took an opportunist view of the boom in moralizing. The truth may be otherwise, but the inescapable fact is that the gulf created in the theatre at the Restoration by the complete break with the Christian and ethical tradition began to be bridged

in the homely moral melodramas of our grandfathers. Crude they certainly were, but their values were sound. Typical of the species were Henry Arthur Jones's emotional epic, *The Silver King,* and Pratt's *Ten Nights in a Bar Room,* which suggests a film featuring the Marx Brothers, but is actually a prohibitionist sermon. Nowadays bright young persons sometimes revive them for the fun of it. For their wider significance rather than for their intrinsic merit they deserve more respect.

True, Edwardian comedy looks back to the theatre of the Restoration. And Edwardian comedy, up to the present, has been the modern playhouse's safest commercial proposition. Barrie, Somerset Maugham, Lonsdale, Milne, St. John Ervine, Noel Coward (putting aside his musical plays) are all, essentially, Edwardian dramatists. It matters not whether their forte be cushioned sentiment or glossy sophistication. Yet, since the beginning of the century, a new mood—or an old mood, if you take my standpoint—has been emerging. It is present in the work of the sociologist dramatists—in Shaw, in Auden and Isherwood; in the psychological and philosophical work of J. B. Priestley. It predominates in writers who are rather more than sociologists and philosophers—among whom James Bridie is a most interesting case in point.

Bridie has often been described as unpredictable and individual. He is certainly capricious. But his strangeness, which has often bewildered the English mind, is the strangeness of the old Moralities. To mention only a portion of his now considerable output, *Tobias and the Angel, Jonah and the Whale, The Dragon and the Dove,* and *Mr. Bolfry* are Moralities which, minus the topical allusions, would have been understood and relished by a medieval audience.

Even that is not quite the end of our journey. Religious plays gave place, originally, to increasingly secularized Moralities. In our case Religious drama has been reborn out of Moralities. We have today a drama which is asking the old question, 'What is man?' with a new urgency and poignancy. It comes from the pens of established writers like T. S. Eliot and Dorothy Sayers, and from others whose reputations have yet to be established fully, among whom may be mentioned Richard Ward, Norman Nicholson and Frank Baker.

'Behold, we make all things new!' A casual survey suggests that claim may be true. On closer acquaintance with both past and present it becomes clear, however, that in fact Thespis, long fallen from his high estate, is showing signs of redemption. The drama has ended its sojourn in the drawing room and come back into the real world, wrestling once more with the problems of eternity within the setting of time.

PASTOR AND PEOPLE

[Under this heading competent writers deal with problems which confront ministers in the course of their ordinary pastoral work.]

THE DOCTOR'S VIEW OF THE CHAPLAIN'S MINISTRY TO THE SICK*

By J. Burnett Rae, M.B., Ch.B.

This is a Conference of chaplains not of doctors, but you have asked me to say something about the way in which the chaplain can help the physician and how we can co-operate with each other in our common task. It would be presumptuous for any doctor to tell the chaplain how to conduct his own business. I shall avoid any such mistake: I am concerned only with your work in so far as it impinges upon ours.

If we have a common task and interest, it is obviously the well-being of the patient, the person in hospital or sick room, but our interest in him differs. The doctor is concerned to cure his disease and turn him out once more hale and hearty. The chaplain is also interested in this, but his concern goes deeper and further, and the question we have to consider is whether the chaplain's interest in the spiritual well-being of the patient has anything to do with the doctor's business, and whether the doctor's work has anything to do with the chaplain's. In former days the doctor was apt to think that the less likely the patient's recovery, the more appropriate became the chaplain's ministry, which led logically to the unhappy practice of calling in the chaplain only when a case was hopeless. It can be understood that under these conditions his services were regarded with anxiety, if not with dread, both by the patient and the relatives. In those days, of course, the essential unity of the patient's nature was less understood; he had a body and he had a soul; the doctor looked after the one and the parson the other. The arrangement had its advantages; one avoided treading on the other's toes, but it led to a separation of our ministries to the sick which was not in the patient's interest. Many cases were left quite untouched because they fell into a gap between the priest and physician and as a result found their way into strange consulting rooms. Until the advent of medical psychology, this no-man's land became the happy hunting ground of all sorts of peculiar practitioners.

That state of affairs is happily passing; medical psychology will

* A paper read to a conference of Chaplains and Free Church Chaplains under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Kingston.

have none of it. Linking as it does the spiritual and physical natures of man, the mind or *psyche* has a great influence upon both these aspects of human nature. One does not need to be a psychologist to know that emotions such as fear, anger, resentment, depression, affect both our spirits and our bodies. These belong to different planes; "that which is born of the flesh is flesh and that which is born of the spirit is spirit", but they are closely related, and we accept the Old Testament saying "What a man thinketh in his heart so is he" or, as Shakespeare puts it, "It is in ourselves that we are thus and thus".

The relationship of psychology to religion is a matter of great interest and one I should have liked to consider in detail with you, but that is not my intention this afternoon; time will not permit and I must paint my canvas with a broader brush. We have to consider the ways in which our co-operation can best be secured, and I have thought that a psychologist could not do better than describe, as simply as possible, the kind of man we have to treat. The title of my address might have been "The Psychology of the Patient in Hospital". I am not going to say a word about his complaint, only about himself. We shall treat, not gout in John Brown, but John Brown for gout. Now the first thing that both the doctor and the parson have to remember is that John Brown is a sick man and that his psychology is that of a sick man. On this account it would be unfair to judge him by the standards we expect from a healthy man; and we should very soon let him know that we do not expect that, not because he is naturally a person of poor mental or physical character, but simply because he is sick and therefore not quite himself, not the fine fellow he usually is and will be again. When you have made that clear, not in words, of course, but by your sympathetic approach, you may already have done something of real value; you have made him sympathetic to you. He knows that in a very important respect you know your business; you have won the first round. I go further. I shall say that you have already set in motion a healing force—the therapeutic influence of kindness.

> Let us quote (write Dejerine and Gauckler) a few lines in which Bernadin de St. Pierre has defined, more exactly and better perhaps than we could, and with a sort of prescience of what is needed, the very rôle we would like to see our physicians adopt towards their patients.
>
> 'I wish that there might be formed in large cities an establishment, somewhat resembling those which charitable physicians and wise juries have formed in Paris, to remedy the evils both of the body and of one's fortunes: I mean councils for consolations, where an unfortunate, sure of his secret being kept and even of his incognito, might bring up the subject of his troubles. We have, it is true, confessors

> and preachers to whom the sublime function of offering consolation to the unfortunate seems to be reserved. But the confessors are not always at the disposition of their penitents. As for the preachers, their sermons serve more as nourishment for souls than as a remedy, for they do not preach against boredom, or unhappiness, or scruples, or melancholy, or vexation, or ever so many evils that affect the soul. It is not easy to find in a timid and depressed personality the exact point about which he is grieving, and to pour balm into his wounds with the hand of the Samaritan. It is an art known only to sympathetic souls. Oh! If only men who knew the science of grief could give unfortunate people the benefit of their experience and sympathy, many miserable souls would come to seek from them the consolation which they cannot get from preachers or all the books of philosophy in the world. Often, to comfort the troubles of men, all that is necessary is to find out from what they are suffering'.

Some people more than others have this gift of understanding sympathy. These are the born doctors, nurses and other ministers. They inspire confidence and peace as soon as they enter the sick room; when they leave, you are a healthier, happier person, you have more hope in your heart, and the quiet mind. Fortunate indeed the man, woman or child who at home or in hospital finds such a person at the bedside.

The chaplain should be the harbinger of life not of death. Whatever the state of the patient, that should be his rôle. A Quaker friend told me that when her great-aunts were old and very ill they were so happy at the prospect of dying, and of the future life, that they began to get better; they could not die, for the weaker they were the stronger they became—they were always so happy about it! This surely is one of the first duties of the chaplain, to diffuse round the patient's bedside a spirit of happiness, of joy through faith, and strength through joy. Obviously, this requires much care and commonsense. We have all heard of the breezy, unsympathetic voyager slapping a seasick fellow passenger on the back and saying "Keep it up old man" and the reply "I'm trying to keep it down". There is a difference between being hilarious and being happy. There must be nothing false or forced about your good cheer, and just because your work is so fraught with meaning, the patient may be suspicious of good feeling which does not seem to be founded upon a basis of fact.

When I used the word 'sympathy' I associated it with 'understanding', and before I pass on I would say a word about that. It is the chaplain's duty to understand the problem and situation of the sick man. It is not his affair to diagnose or understand his disease as the doctor should. That is a technical, scientific matter which should be left in other hands. It is a great

mistake for the chaplain to become involved either in physiological or psychological complexities and mechanisms. He has other, and for him, much better things to do and the patients know it. I remember being told about an elderly Scottish lady, devoted to her old and revered minister, who was being visited by his younger colleague. The newcomer, quite a brilliant young man, no doubt to show his interest in the malady, was in the habit during his pastoral visit, of taking her pulse. This had anything but the desired effect, and describing to a friend the difference between the young man and the older minister, she said "Ah weel, there was no taking of pulses about Mr. Wilson; he got on with his ain job". That indicates pretty clearly what I mean. Do not misunderstand me: the chaplain in hospital should have a genuine interest in the sick man's condition and progress, but he has a particular contribution to make towards this. Nor am I advocating that your approach to the patient should be heavy or solemn; but what you have nothing to do with, do nothing with. Remember and magnify your own high office. You will then, as you come down in sympathy to the level of your patient, at the same time be lifting him up to a new level of health and hope.

So far, I have had in mind the psychology of the ordinary patient, but one must remember that no two are uniformly alike and there are some who need your help more urgently than others. For this reason you should not exhaust your time and energy upon those who can get for themselves what others cannot and what is in your power to provide. These cases you will discover for yourself, but if you keep in touch with the discerning doctor or ward sister, you will be greatly helped.

The psychiatrist, because of his special knowledge, should be, if you are in his confidence, a very great support. Your collaboration with him should be most cordial and of mutual benefit. I hope that in future this co-operation may become in certain cases the ordinary therapeutic procedure. In cases where a moral and religious factor is predominant it is absolutely required unless, of course, the psychologist is himself qualified for both rôles.

It is a right instinct that leads the medical man to investigate and discover the cause of disease. We are too apt to think of medical science as concerned with drugs, or appliances and operations. This is an incidental connection that may pass away within the next twenty or thirty years. The real contribution of medicine consists in the discovery of the underlying cause of disease, for when you know that you are in a position to prevent and overcome it. You know then the conditions, physical and mental, that are necessary for healing to occur. Knowing what has to be done, you can then concentrate upon the disease those forces which are in life, and which without doubt are sufficient

to remove it. There must be diagnosis if there is to be good treatment. Merely to remove a symptom is not enough, and may be dangerous, for it is to remove a danger signal. The value of knowing what is wrong is that it enables one to know and do what is right. After analysis comes the synthesis.

The physician's business is to deal with the evil, the clergyman's to promote the good. Neither doctor nor chaplain is exclusively concerned with one or the other, but in general those are their respective rôles. Although the analyst may feel confident to conduct also the synthesis, and although the chaplain may feel able in many cases to analyse the patient's trouble—especially if it has its roots in a moral conflict—yet in either case co-operation between doctor and chaplain should prove of great value.

It is unnecessary for me to say that if this conspiracy of loving kindness is to be helpful it must go on behind the scenes. Mr. G. K. Chesterton in one of his essays has described a sick room in which a physician sits on one side of the patient's bed and a chaplain on the other, while a healer hovers around baffled and furious. I can think of nothing more calculated to upset a patient unless it were for the doctor, the chaplain and the ward sister to appear before a patient in full view of the ward. That, of course, would be a patient's nightmare, only comparable to certain ward rounds in military hospitals. These may be excused by the exigencies of military conditions, but there would be no excuse for a chaplain if he were to take part in any such procedure. It would be a spiritual and psychological outrage, especially in the case of those patients who, because of their sensitivity, are most in need of his support. There are some patients who, until they recover or die, want to go away from their kind like wounded animals, but there are others who crave our help and companionship, and only when they get it, are they able to meet bravely their problem or their pain. Given this help they are often the very best of patients, for usually they are above the average in intelligence and imagination.

In saying this, I am not forgetting those self-centred persons who are always ready to exploit the sympathy of others: they have to be treated with firmness. This type is not infrequent in hospital, when the patient becomes just a number in the ward; doctors, nurses, chaplains and others circulating round him with their interesting procedures. Up to a point this may take the patient out of himself. "Medicine" said Voltaire "is the art of interesting the patient while Nature effects the cure". But something more is needed. There are those who get into the way of doing little or nothing for themselves. And I can imagine certain patients being not altogether averse to an intelligent doctor sitting on one side of the bed, and a sympathetic, good-looking parson

on the other, herself the object of their consideration. We have heard of the flight into illness, and when I read in the New Testament of that unfortunate man at the Pool of Bethesda who had been there for forty years, and never once succeeded in getting into the pool at the right moment, I sometimes wonder whether he was really trying, or perhaps just waiting for some sympathetic person to help him. The question that our Lord put "Wilt thou be made whole"—do you really want to get well?—certainly justifies the suspicion. Many cases that we see make it necessary for us to realize that while the physician and others help, without the effort of the patient himself, nothing of any permanent value can occur.

I wish to stress the importance of the will to get well. The human will, what can it not accomplish? History is a record of its achievements. Our patients are not animals but human beings, and as such have a capacity which the lower animals do not possess in the healing of their own disorders. If he can make his bed in hell, he can also rise to the highest heaven, but wherever he is, and in whatever state of body or mind, a man is able if he uses the capacity with which he has been endowed, to transcend his limitations.

Now it is just here, as I see it, that the clergyman has his opportunity by helping the patient to realize this capacity which he possesses, of bringing on to the field of battle, the resources of his personality. So often, the sick man is using his gifts of thought and imagination in such a way that he not only thwarts his own effort but also that of his doctor. The whole environment about him may be such as to suggest disease rather than health; and so the order of the Apostle to keep thinking about things that are good and true and lovely and of good report is reversed with devastating results. I do not mean for a moment that we should ignore the fact of suffering, or make ourselves try to believe, like the Christian Scientist, that it does not exist, but the patient must be helped to see the evil in the context of the good, the lesser in the light of the greater, if he is to have the peace of the man whom Wordsworth describes as "having among least things an under-sense of the greatest, sees the part as part, with a feeling of the whole"—the whole, that is health. How much can be done to help the patient, who is so liable to see his suffering and his situation in a disturbed and fantastic way which frightens and alarms him, to see it as it really is and in the right proportion!

That, I think, is what *par excellence* you are able to do. Just because you are a layman as far as medical affairs are concerned, by helping the patient to see things as you see them, and the hospital, not as a place of disease but as a place where great healing forces are at work, you will help to restore his confidence.

And how important that is! The man who has no faith in himself can exercise but little faith in others for he distrusts his own judgment. Faith in oneself and faith in what is other and beyond oneself go well together. Christ spoke much about faith to all who sought His help; faith in themselves, faith in Him, faith in God.

When the patient has this confidence it means that he will see things steadily and see them whole. He has a sense of being unified and complete. By whatever means that is achieved, a healing process is set in operation; he is on the breast of a great healing tide. That is why we may say quite truly, if paradoxically, that the patient must be made whole before he can be healed. The personality has to be integrated before the healing forces of life can permeate to the body and heal its disease.

When Christ said to the paralysed man "Stretch forth your hand", he might have replied "Sir, that is the one thing I cannot do". But his faith in the healer made him whole; then he could respond to the command. By faith you become what you ought to be; you know what you really are.

I have referred to the patient's will and the effort he must make. We are apt to associate this effort with strenuousness and activity, and it may be asked, 'What can a patient, cribbed, cabined and confined by his condition, do for himself?' And is there not the disconcerting fact that sometimes the more we try to do a thing, the less we appear to succeed? The law of reversed effort, as Baudouin called it, comes into operation. Is it wise to require any such effort from the bedridden man? Should he not be told just to lie back and do nothing, leaving everything to others?

Now a patient may be confined and crippled in many ways, but his mind is free. "I could be bounded in a nutshell", said Hamlet, "yet think myself a king of infinite space". And often when we are laid aside we have an exceptionally good opportunity of using the mind and that great gift, our imagination—the instrument of faith—to greater advantage than when business and other responsibilities press their claims upon us. As an engine which is to be run on a new gear must first be put into neutral, so it is with the mind: and there the physician and the good nurse come in, for by alleviating his pain and using other comforting measures the patient is helped to attain that serenity, "that placidity of mind in which alone", as Walter Pater said, "the business of the spirit can be done". It is here also that you come in most effectively.

By our thought we open the door of our being to either good or ill. "There is nothing right or wrong, but thinking makes it

so''. Thought has this transforming power; it can convert something purely spiritual into something mental, and that again into something material. Such transmutation is going on all the time around us. The soil, through the alchemy of nature, gives us our fruit and vegetables and this in turn is converted into milk and meat, which again give energy to our bodies, and thence to our minds, through which we make conscious contact with the spiritual world. Is it incredible, then, that the reverse process should be equally true?

In emphasizing the importance of the patient's own effort and will, I am looking at the matter both from the mental and from the spiritual points of view. Faith is an act of will directed towards God, and where there is a will there is a way.

It should be noted, however, that a lack of volition is not necessarily a conscious fault of the patient; his will may be frustrated by unconscious factors over which he has little control until these are recognized and relieved. The patient with an anxiety neurosis is anxious precisely because there is a conflict between his conscious desire to get well and an unconscious inclination which is against this. ''The native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought''. This arises from an unconscious inhibition or motivation, due perhaps to heredity, or upbringing; or to some vivid experience which made a big impression upon him, producing a style of life to which he reacts unconsciously. This, of course, is the fruitful field of psychology and through your contact with the patient, you may be able to help the psychologist. I should discourage you, however, from always looking for the occult. If something important should emerge from your contact with him you should certainly make use of it, but it would be a first-class mistake for any chaplain to assume that a patient is incapable of co-operating in his treatment because of some unconscious factor beyond his control. That indeed is an objection I have discovered in the method of psychoanalysis when it is not carefully handled. For any patient, anxious and concerned about his mental health and his inability to make a satisfactory adaptation to life, to believe that he can do little or nothing effective for himself until some submerged complex is brought to light, can only add to his anxiety; and the longer the search is continued, the more anxious and depressed he is likely to become. I know the value of the method in certain cases, but I know also its dangers, and I am concerned that you should be in a position to avoid these by helping any patient undergoing this treatment to realize that, whatever need there may be for analysis, or whatever its result, the patient is responsible for his life and conduct; his will and effort are always required and nothing can take their place. If a patient is honestly co-operat-

ing with his analyst in an endeavour to discover the cause of his disorder he is certainly entitled to your respect, for that is a courageous attitude and more admirable than any unworthy resignation to ill-health; but some patients are too much influenced by the idea that until the cause of their trouble is discovered any effort on their part is futile.

Let me suggest then a word about the character of the effort which it is your duty to encourage. The effort needed is the redirection of attention; that, as William James has said, is the essential phenomenon of the will. It is comparable to the action of the steersman, who by a flick of his finger on the wheel of the Queen Elizabeth can deflect the course of a great vessel. Many suppose willpower means that one has to meet any obstacle by bringing up a force great enough to overcome it. That force certainly is required, but you do not provide it, you turn it on, and direct it. Physiologists tell us the will is exercised, not by providing power but by removing the inhibition and so releasing it. You open the sluices and through them power flows, which you direct. That is in line with what the mystics and great leaders of religion have always taught; that man should be a channel of the Divine and that its pressure is always upon us. What we have to do is to remove any obstruction to its flow. That is true of medical science. The doctor never claims to cure. He removes what is obstructing the cure. Can the patient not help in such a process? He certainly can and he can be helped quietly to turn his mind in the right direction, in the direction of health and of things that make for it. This, I am afraid is not always the case. In hospital, e.g. surrounded by evidence of sickness and suffering and all the paraphernalia of doctors and nurses by his side, away from his home, his work and his friends, conscious of his weakness and pain, is he not very liable to turn his mind in the direction rather of what is false and ill-reported upon than what is true? All this must make him apprehensive and afraid.

Help him, then, to understand and realize the extent to which he can really help in his treatment, by directing his thoughts to better things. By so doing he will automatically open his whole being to the inflow of Divine and healing forces, which can do for him what he could not, by any effort of his, do for himself. This, I think, is what Christ meant by faith; belief in the power of the good, and that this works mightily for those who believe in it, and claim it. This release or removal of what may be obstructive is very important and must be effected in ways suitable to the character of the case. I believe that for the normal person, the practice of confession, of thanksgiving, of prayer and worship have this value, and on that account are health-giving.

Sometimes more expert direction is required to liberate the patient's mind from the inhibitory effects of some degrading fear or anxiety.

A woman was sent to me in hospital; she had a persistent fear of cancer, centring in a trouble of quite minor importance; no amount of reassurance by different doctors, X-ray photographs and what not had any effect; she lived in dread of this disease. I discovered that some years previously she had been equally concerned over a bronchial cold; then she was sure she had tuberculosis. Going into her history, I learned that she had lost her mother when a child, and had been brought up by a stepmother who could never see any good in her; whatever she did was wrong. Not unnaturally in these circumstances she always expected the worst; life was like that to her. I pointed out that her experience was quite abnormal, that as a matter of fact life was not like that at all, that things usually turned out much better than we expected or deserved. I told her that she must try to realize this, think and believe it; she saw the wisdom of so doing and was free from her fear almost immediately.

What I have been saying about the importance of detaching certain complexes from their central place in the *psyche* and seeing them in their right relationship is equally applicable to ourselves as a whole. We have to lose ourselves to find ourselves; and we can only find them as we lose them in what is greater and beyond ourselves.

I have been using, I am well aware, the language of physics and of physiology to describe a relationship which is essentially personal. God is a spirit, a power, an intelligence, a love which can direct, guide and inspire the conscious mind of man as well as penetrate to the unconscious and through it to all the tissues of the body. In this relationship there is man's part as well as God's. He helps them who help themselves by making more effective their activities, and by helping them when they cannot help themselves, when they come to the end of their resources. If we can do nothing without Him, let us remember that Christ said He could do nothing for some people because of their unbelief, because they would not co-operate with Him.

Perhaps we should not ask the question, at what point does man's effort cease and the Divine help begin? They should be combined. It is a mistake to regard Divine Healing as another form of therapeutics to be brought into operation when other methods have failed. A doctor once told me, when he had failed, that he thought it was only right to give the Christian Scientist or Spiritual Healer a chance. This is to misconceive entirely the character of Divine Healing. It is not one method among others, but rather the soul of all healing, infusing into all our methods,

surgical, medical, psychological, a motive and spirit which lift them up to a higher power and direct them to a finer end. In saying this I do not mean that the chaplain has not opportunities and means at his disposal which, as a Christian minister, he is in a special position to employ, but I deprecate the attempt to confine spiritual healing to any particular method he may use, such as anointing with oil or the laying on of hands. These means, in suitable cases, may be very appropriately included in his practice; they suggest, and symbolize beautifully, the truth that healing is a gift of God, a gift to be taken most humbly and thankfully from the Divine Healer who forgives our iniquities and heals our diseases. It is a gift that we claim and appropriate by the grasp of faith—faith in God be it noted; not merely in the elements or means themselves. It is the sacramental principle I am contending for when I say that we should not remove Divine Healing to a separate and superior place, leaving outside its ambit those more usual means of healing which by knowledge and experience we have good reason to trust.

The point at which God's help is immediately available is that of man's need; and as there is something in our human nature which impels us to attempt the impossible, to be perfect as God Himself is perfect, we are always in need of His love and power.

I have noticed, and I am sure you have also, that it is when we have been most conscious of our need, most aware of our complete inadequacy to do what we know we ought to do, and when in desperation we have thrown ourselves without reserve upon the grace of God, that help comes in a way neither logic nor imagination could have foreseen; I do not know any explanation of this fact apart from the reality of those things which we believe. I cannot account for it in any other way than that God is willing and able to help us in our work for Him and for one another.

In any discussion of this sort the question inevitably arises as to whether suffering may be the will of God and whether we are entitled to fight against it. We should not spend too much time over this. The Master, although He said little if anything about the origin of evil, endeavoured by every means in His power to defeat it, and He was always willing to cure and relieve the suffering which was its consequence. Sometimes we may have to accept suffering—that caused, for example, by the loss of a limb or a sense such as sight or hearing, or as a consequence of some crippling disease.

We may take comfort in the fact that suffering is often of the greatest value in helping us to discover its cause and so avoid its recurrence, or to spare others a similar fate. But if we must sometimes accept suffering, always we must struggle against evil

and disease. The acceptance of suffering under certain conditions is totally different from that sickly resignation to ill-health, sometimes called Christian by those who forget that Christianity is a gospel of healing and of health. To fight and not to heed the wound is a very different thing from quitting the field and leaving it in possession of the enemy, a different thing from that "noble yielding of oneself to necessity", which Euripides described as the hallmark of him who knoweth the things of God. This necessity, however, may be just the index of our human fallibility and ignorance. The greater part of our suffering we bring upon ourselves; nor let us fall too readily into the arrogance of thinking that disease is incurable because we do not know how to cure it.

The belief that God is with us in our efforts to heal, makes for the quiet mind and the humble and receptive heart. This springs from a belief that if the situation is to be transformed a new factor must come in; something we cannot do for ourselves or get by our unaided effort. When we know that experience as a wonderful fact in our lives, we shall have something to give to those who are in like need to ourselves. When one man believes another catches the flame. When that flame burns brightly in the hospital it becomes less of an institution and more of a temple of healing. It has what we call atmosphere. Some hospitals have this and others have not, and it depends entirely upon the personnel. I am very sure that when it is present, things can happen which otherwise cannot, things which the physiologist or pathologist can observe, but never explain, things such as Christ did and which He said we should do also if we had a like faith.

Lord Rosebery once said that medicine is a magnificent but forlorn hope because death always wins in the end. That may be true as far as the body is concerned, but not of the man himself. Sir Thomas Browne in his *Religio Medici* wrote,

> "As for the world I count it not an inn but a hospital, a place not to live but to die in" but then he goes on to remark "there is surely a piece of divinity in us all, something that was before the elements and owes no homage to the sun; there is something in us that can be without us and will be after us".

Part of your gracious ministry is to help the patient, when in the course of time and nature he comes to the valley of the shadow, to walk there without fear, confident that he will be guided and comforted by Him who walked that shaded way Himself. "As the outward man perishes the inward man is renewed".

> Be welcome years, with corn and sickle come,
> Make poor the body, yet make rich the heart,
> What man that bears his sheaves, gold-nodding home,
> Will heed the paint rubbed from his groaning cart?

That, then, as I see it, is the way in which you can best serve the interests of your patient in hospital, and co-operate with the doctor. Our hospitals had their origin in our Lord's injunction to heal the sick and preach the gospel. In the inspiration of His example they grew up and developed. Doctors and clergy together must see that this atmosphere, which is a thing of the spirit, is preserved at all costs, and it can only be in so far as we suffuse our work with the spirit of faith, and hope, and love, the love that casts out fear and that is stronger than death.

"The Age of our fathers, who were not a patch on our grandparents, has produced our deplorable selves, whose offspring will be far worse". (Horace) Wells, who, according to Joad, has done more than any contemporary for adult education, died blaspheming Progress and declaring that his mind, and, inferentially, the human mind, was at the end of its tether. Everybody except the professional optimists of the B.B.C. agrees that our case is hopeless. It is time to send for Dr. Joad. His opinions, as expressed in *Decadence : A Philosophical Inquiry* (Faber, 12s. 6d.), are interesting and suggestive, and, from the Christian point of view, reassuring. His diagnosis is that the decadence from which we are suffering is due to the loss of a sense of values. We pursue the means and forget the end; we "drop the object". God not man is the measure of all things. The chief end of man is to know God and enjoy Him forever, says the Westminster Catechism. Nowadays we say, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow the Atom Bomb falls". So far, so good. Dr. Joad seems sound on Natural Theology. He becomes less lucid when he tries to combine History with Philosophy. His diagnosis is admirable, his prognosis a little obscure. Decadent ages, he tells us, are nicer to live in. Ovid says the same thing in one of his less respectable poems. But the mark of the hungry nineteen-forties is austerity without sanctity, too much control and too little self-control, all Lent and no Carnival. The youngest generation is marked by "vigour, crudity, zeal and discomfort", all the disagreeable qualities of the Ages of Faith. We have none of the comfort of religion and all its discomforts. A passing phase, perhaps; we must perish in the wilderness that our posterity, if any, may reach the Promised Land.

GAMALIEL MILNER.

BOOKS OF THE QUARTER

(The place of publication is London unless stated otherwise)

God and Men. By HERBERT H. FARMER, D.D. Nisbet. 10s. 6d.

These seven lectures on the Lyman Beecher foundation, delivered at Yale University in April 1946, "were meant to be of some help . . . to working ministers". They certainly will be; for Dr. Farmer's main concern, which is "to present the great verities of our faith in such wise that *their radical and consistent personalism* is convincingly set forth", is finely achieved. It is no mean achievement; for, as he says, Christianity's "intense personalism" is not only "perhaps *the* central issue, in the relations of Christian truth to the contemporary mind. It is this which more than anything else runs counter" to the prevailing culture of the West.

"At no point in its revelation of the ultimate realities", Dr. Farmer insists, will Christianity "allow us to pass into an impersonalised world"; and "the personal world is one which includes the infinite personal God as well as the finite persons of men and women". "The doctrine of the Incarnation", furthermore, "is part of the radical personalism of Christianity and of its understanding of the true nature of the personal order". "God's will of love is directed always to the fashioning of finite persons into worthy sonship to Himself". His dealings with men are, therefore, "always *in the last resort* personal, and never *merely* manipulative and over-riding". Dr. Farmer ends with a courageous repudiation of "the craving and expectancy that God should rule men's lives on a basis of strict distributive justice". The governing principle of the Kingdom of God, "a kingdom of persons in relationship", is not justice "but a sacrificial self-giving which knows and desires no other good thing than to be at one with God, and with all persons, in love".

The course of the argument is indicated by headlines, such as "The Individuality of Persons", "The Independence of Persons", "Trust between Persons", "Harmony between Persons". Personal response to a personal God has always been a distinguishing note of the authentic Free Church tradition, and it is a note for which many today are listening.

The Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness. By HAROLD KNIGHT. Lutterworth Press. 10s. 6d.

Two Hebrew Prophets: Studies in Hosea and Ezekiel. By H. WHEELER ROBINSON. Lutterworth Press. 6s.

Dr. Knight's book is divided into two parts: History and Psychology; and Theology. In the first part, he shows that of the two types of prophecy underlying the Hebrew prophetic consciousness the divinatory type was native to Israel and the ecstatic type essentially alien; the ecstatic type makes its contribution, but only after significant transformation. The writing prophet, he claims, is not to be contrasted with the charismatic prophet (*nabi*)—he is in fact "the fine flower of the *nabi* movement"—but with the professional priest-prophet. The writing prophet's authority lies in "the sheer directness of his peculiar personal experience of God". Wisely, the prophet and the mystic are distinguished but not set in opposition: for "the prophetic consciousness shares the immediacy and intensity which characterize the mystic's apprehension of God".

The second part of the book, in which Dr. Knight considers the theological implications of the Hebrew prophetic consciousness, is richly rewarding. His subjects are Revelation and Authority ("a spiritual and intrinsic authority", with "self-evidencing power"); Man and God (man's "resemblance to God springs from his inalienable capacity for . . . dynamic fellowship"); the Personality of God ("for prophetic religion, personality, in man *and God*, is central"); Divine Pathos or Passibility ("an integral element in the consciousness of the prophets"); Time and Eternity ("time was all; yet . . . possessed . . . a supreme spiritual significance"); and History ("All was *Heilsgeschichte*—the manifestation of God's purpose"). Five pages "Towards a Hebrew-Christian Metaphysic" close a clear, bold statement of "the creative religious faith which informs the Hebrew Bible", even when this involves "a sharp and irreconcilable opposition" to "traditional classical Christian theology".

How firmly Dr. Knight stands in the Wheeler Robinson tradition appears from *Two Hebrew Prophets*, which is edited by the Rev. E. A. Payne. The Higher Anthropomorphism, The Passibility of God, The Relation to Historical Revelation all recur here. The pages on Ezekiel will bring understanding to many, and those on Hosea will do more, as they bring the message of "The Cross of Hosea": the message that "a patient and enduring love, eloquent through its suffering, will at last avail to penetrate to the spirit within and transform its alienation". Wheeler Robinson quotes with approval the words of a Jew, "Christianity is Judaism run divinely mad".

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Jesus, Son of Man. By G. S. DUNCAN. Nisbet. 16s.

This book is divided into three parts: "The Historical Problem", "The Person of Jesus", and "Jesus and the Church". With Prof. Duncan's attitude to the historical problem there will be agreement on the part of those who refuse to believe that it is a hopeless task, and who hold that the quest of the historical Jesus is capable of reaching its goal. I cannot feel, however, that the writer's guidance does bring us to that goal.

The Jesus who is here depicted is too far removed from His Jewish environment. Central to Prof. Duncan's argument is his explanation of the title "Son of Man" in terms of *Ezekiel, i.e.*, He is primarily a prophet and the representative of "His brethren of mankind". If He believed Himself to be the Messiah, the conception lay at the periphery of His interpretation of His mission. But in view of the familiar association of the Messiah with the hope of Israel, it is inconceivable that, if Jesus thought of Himself as the Messiah at all, the conception of Messiahship did not lie right at the centre of His thinking. And if He did believe He was the Messiah, then, in spite of His own interpretation of that rôle, He must have shared the apocalyptic hope of the final consummation of the Kingdom of God, and the sayings about His coming again in glory as the Son of Man must be interpreted in the same apocalyptic sense. Prof. Duncan holds that these apocalyptic hopes are foreign to the mind of Jesus, and that the whole idea of a Second Coming is due to the misunderstanding of the early Church. What Jesus really meant was that His future coming was the future aspect of His one coming. That Jesus thought in this way I cannot believe. Along these lines we may pursue, to quote the sub-title of the book, "studies contributory to a modern portrait", but these studies do not bring us to the first-century Jew, Jesus of Nazareth. Apocalyptic is by no means the decisive factor, but it is too deeply ingrained in the Gospel tradition to be removed.

Yet this book strikes the right note in its intention to discover the historical Jesus, and to demonstrate the essential reliability of the witness of the Gospels to Him. This good intention is not fulfilled, because "an acceptable modern portrait" of the Jesus of history is a contradiction in terms.

A. J. B. Higgins.

***Dr. C. J. Cadoux's posthumous *Life of Jesus* (Penguin, 1s. 6d.) has appeared too late for notice in this number, but we hope to review it in the next.—G.F.N.

The First Europe. By C. Delisle Burns. Allen & Unwin. 25s.

Any study of the formation of our European civilization, with its Classical and Christian components, is of contemporary importance, much more so one by the erudite, balanced, and distinguished mind of Dr. Delisle Burns. He distinguishes between three Europes: the first of medieval Christendom, which concerns him here; the second, originating in the Renaissance and Reformation, characterized by sovereign states, prevented from mutual annihilation by concentration on imperialist expansion; and the third now painfully coming to birth. He claims that there are valid analogies between the first Europe, the subject of his analysis, and the third Europe into which we are passing.

His multifactoral analysis of the formative forces is of particular importance, since he rejects any determinist explanation, urging that new dangers and new possibilities of initiative, the confused struggle for wealth and power, and new moral and social ideals, expressed in individuals and communities, all played their part. The moral factor predominates in his analysis, because the Christian leaders "established the bases of that moral authority which conquest, plotting, and the seizure of wealth and power could not provide" (p. 39). The rôles as the creators of this new civilization were played by Augustine, Leo I, Epiphanius, Isidore, Eligius, Bede and Boniface; and they receive their due reward from a historian who clearly stands outside the Christian Churches.

Our fundamental criticism is that Dr. Delisle Burns, whilst asserting the primacy of the 'moral' factor, depreciates the significance of doctrine. Whilst we agree that ecclesiastical historians may have overestimated the part played by doctrinal controversies in the period, this is itself an indication that medieval men took their theological views in desperate earnestness. The morality was itself given authority by the Church's claim to mediate a *revelation* to which the Scriptures testified, and on which Pope Leo I, for example, grounded his authority. This revelation of the Word made flesh, however overlaid by unScriptural additions, was the ultimate authority of the early medieval Church. Without this recognition, the morality and the impetus to create new communities adequate to express the new insights into the nature of man are meaningless. Theology, in the strict sense, was the authority and the dynamic of the morality. True, the author hints (p. 648) that "the theory of 'revelation' . . . will be discussed elsewhere", but his untimely death has robbed us of the second volume he had in mind to produce. It is clear, however, that he depreciates "revelation" as consisting merely of acceptance of "the practices of primitive Semitic tribes as models for the Christian kingdoms and Churches of mediæval Europe" (p. 648). This utterly fails to do justice to the influence of the New Testament in such diverse matters as the sacraments, racial unity, and the monastic life, to take but three examples.

In spite of this theological *lacuna* the book is a thorough, vivid, re-examination of the sources of Christian Europe, based upon the study of the original documents and a first-hand knowledge of a traveller and administrator in contemporary Europe.

HORTON DAVIES.

Walker Revised: being a revision of John Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy during the Grand Rebellion 1642-60*. By A. G. MATTHEWS. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 40s.

A Norfolk Gallery. By R. W. KETTON-CREMER. Faber. 21s.

In the fourteen years since it appeared, *Calamy Revised* has become a first-class standard work, regularly referred to in all scholarly studies of the beginnings of Nonconformity. Its excessively modest title concealed the fact that it was virtually a new work, based largely on MS. material not used by Calamy. Moreover, though in outward appearance no more than a biographical directory of the ejected ministers of 1662, it was full of social and educational as well as religious matter, much of which still awaits careful comparative analysis.

Calamy Revised is now followed by *Walker Revised*. Walker's *Sufferings* (1714), a study of the clergy whose livings were sequestered during the Great Rebellion, was a retort to Calamy's study of the ministers ejected at the Restoration. That two works in origin so mutually hostile should now have one and the same editor says something of the softening effects of time as well as of the possibilities of high scholarship. We may be proud that a Congregationalist has done this work.

The two volumes of revision inevitably invite comparison, and for clarity and accuracy in the presentation of additional MS. material they are good companions. Those familiar with *Calamy Revised* will, it is true, have some disappointments. *Calamy Revised* was arranged alphabetically by persons, and had an admirable *Index Locorum*. In *Walker Revised* Mr. Matthews improves on Walker, but arranges confusingly first by counties but within each county by persons. This makes cross-reference between persons (and the volume is fully cross-referenced) impossible without use of the index; and for places there is no index at all, so that the only way to discover if a particular living was sequestered is to look through all the pages given to the county in which the living was situate. Economy of paper has thus sadly lessened the work's ready usefulness. There is another contrast; for, although, as in *Calamy Revised*, the entries are under persons, there is here nothing about the clergy's parentage, schooling, children, *etc.* The information is confined almost entirely to the years between each man's ejection and the Restoration (or his death, if that came first), and within that period is concentrated on the conditions of his ejection. *Walker Revised* is, in fact, less a biographical directory than a study of the methods and results of sequestration, as contained in the MS. books of the several County and other Committees to whom that task was entrusted. The names of those who "intruded" into livings after the sequestrations are added. This alone (if only the names were indexed) is a most valuable contribution to the mental ordering and eventual understanding of that chaotic period in English Church life. Students of ecclesiastical history in those years will bless Mr. Matthews for another "indispensable" work of reference. Specialists working steadily through his pages will find many a hidden ingot.

In form, *Walker Revised* will appear to most dry and forbidding. Those who would see flesh upon its bones should turn to *A Norfolk Gallery*, where they will meet some of its characters again, such as the Rector of Uggeshall,

who was accused of "eating Custard after a scandalous manner", and the Rector of Burgh-next-Aylsham, who continued to act "in complete defiance of the new order" and to adorn the parish register with characteristic puns and quips. These are among "Some Clerics of the Civil War", and there is also a study of Bishop Hall of Norwich, ejected from his see and living quietly in retirement, "dignified, gentle and unembittered to the end".

The later portraits in the gallery are of the eighteenth century, and here the master's touch is more evident. In a study of George Walpole, the third Earl of Orford, the biographer of Horace Walpole is on ground all his own; and perhaps the best chapters of all are those on Robert Marsham, "a Norfolk squire of moderate estate", who so loved the trees he planted that he would wash them, thus perceptibly increasing their girth, and on the landscape work of Humphrey Repton in Norfolk. "Sheringham Park in its unimproved state" and "as it was to appear after improvement" are among several illustrations to this delightful book.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Pascal and Kierkegaard: A Study in the Strategy of Evangelism. By DENZIL G. M. PATRICK. Lutterworth Press. Vol. I, 15s. Vol. II, 25s.

If by Christian Apologetics is meant the defence of Christianity against contemporary non-Christian trends of life and thought, or an attempt to adapt the substance of the Christian faith to the demands of the natural man, Kierkegaard at least was not an apologist. If, however, the term indicates an aggressive advocacy of Christianity in which the Christian faith is the prosecutor and not the defendant, an advocacy animated by a fearlessly offensive spirit, then both Pascal and Kierkegaard are apologists, and apologists with profound affinities. In this work, after traversing regions of historical and biographical analysis, and leaving behind analogies which, though impressive, might be superficial, Dr. Patrick penetrates to the fundamental consciousness of his subjects and lays bare their anguished awareness of the division in man's personality.

Pascal and Kierkegaard were men of their times who sought to combat the specific evils of their day. The part played by the Jesuits in relation to Pascal was played by the Danish State Church in relation to Kierkegaard. Similarly, the scientific rationalism of the 17th century had its counterpart in the romantic idealism of the 19th century. Underlying these differences is the essential unity of the Renaissance tradition, and it is at the roots of this tradition that both men strike, repudiating intellectualism in the name of existence, and secularism in the name of the Christian faith.

> They challenged the whole anthropology of the Renaissance with its self-sufficient reason, and its affirmation that man is the measure of all things.

Furthermore, though differing in their estimate of the use of reason in apologetics, and in their attitude to the historic Christian Church, Pascal and Kierkegaard are essentially at one in their understanding of human life and their conception of the task of evangelism. In primitive and essential Christianity they find an answer to their own needs and to the deepest needs of their times. They see man as a divided being,

> living without hope and without God in the world, refusing to recognize his true condition, seeking to escape from himself in desperate distractions. Both of them seek to oblige him to know himself, to acknowledge how desperate is his real state; and then they lead him, using now persuasion and now severity, into the presence of God . . . the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

> For them Christ's Cross is the supreme criterion of all else in the world, the only way to a re-establishment of the relationship between man and God which was broken by man's sin. All their dialectic and all their passion . . . is dominated and governed by the Cross, not as an abstract symbol of eternal qualities of human life, but as a terrible historical reality which has cosmic significance for the redemption of a lost world.

In an epilogue Dr. Patrick indicates all too briefly the relevance to present issues of the evangelistic methods pursued by both men. The Christian apologist must be a man of his time, feeling the concerns, and understanding the qualities and defects of his generation; and, to temper this knowledge which necessarily varies from age to age, he must have one perennial characteristic: a living knowledge of the Bible. He is a man "on the warpath". Far from concealing, he will emphasize the offence of the Gospel to the reason and will of the natural man, whom he seeks to strip bare of pretences, and to whom he bars all ways of escape, in order to set him face to face with the problem of his eternal destiny, with his desperate need, and lastly with his Maker. He confronts the natural man with the message of the Christian Gospel, urges upon him the eternal issues which hang upon his acceptance or rejection of it, and leaving him to his choice, commends him to the grace of God.

Dr. Patrick's work presents the "distilled essence of long reflexion" upon the central personalities of his study. The splendid bibliographies testify to his breadth of vision in the academic field. He brought to his task scholarship of the first order, and a nature so sensitive as to discern the real Kierkegaard despite the bias of Christoph Schrempf whose German translation he was obliged largely to follow. Above all, he had the positive attitude to the Christian faith without which neither Pascal nor Kierkegaard can receive a truly just interpretation. CONRAD BONIFAZI.

The Reunion of the Church: a Defence of the South India Scheme. By BISHOP J. E. LESLIE NEWBIGIN. S.C.M. 10s. 6d.

This book should silence any attempt to represent the method of church union adopted in South India as superficial or half-baked. The defence rests upon clear-sighted Biblical scholarship. Part I defines the basis of union: "is it sufficient for men divided on every other ground to have in common their redemption in Christ?". Part II presents the nature of the Church's unity and continuity, and closes with a chapter on the Method of Union. Part III deals with Heads of Agreement: the Standard of Faith, the Ministry of the United Church, and the Sacraments. In Part IV, the Bishop writes with the forthcoming decision of the Lambeth Conference in view: "if South India is to be excommunicated by the Anglican Communion, it can only be because that Communion has decided that it cannot regard non-episcopal Churches as parts of the universal Church", and that decision "must also bring to an end Anglican participation in the ecumenical movement, for it will involve a clear rejection of its starting-point".

The most rewarding section of the book is Part II, in which the writer restates with great penetration and clearness the Pauline doctrines of Redemption and of the Church. The death of Christ is shown to be both representative and substitutionary. The Church is founded upon the shattering of all human egotism, for the moment a man becomes what he was intended to be, a creature knowing that he owes everything to God's grace, all the barriers that he erects against God and his fellow-men are broken down. Division between Christians, therefore, is a sign of *carnality*, of their having fallen back on man. The decisive "marks" of the Church are to

be found "not in institutional continuity, but in the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel in which Christ is constantly re-presented to men in His redeeming work". But the Church's unity is not merely spiritual: "it is the unity of one divine organism, existing in time and space, yet showing the life of eternity" for "the terms Holy Spirit and Body of Christ are correlates".

It is a little surprising to find that continuity and succession are discussed in terms of authority, rather than of function or ministry. Bishop Newbigin maintains that acceptance of the historic episcopate does not involve acceptance of the doctrine that episcopacy is the divinely appointed basis of the Church, and he shows that Anglican exclusiveness can rest only on the appeal to the continuity of the episcopal ministry, not on the continuity and unity of the Church as a whole. Where Bishop Newbigin is drawn into polemic, he conducts it ably and temperately, with Scripture and sanity as weapons. No one concerned for greater understanding between the churches can afford to miss this book.

KATHLEEN L. CARRICK SMITH.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

From the Hillside (Independent Press, 5s.) by Dr. G. Glenn Atkins is the Lenten book for 1948 for the Congregational Churches of the U.S.A. and Great Britain. It is a series of meditations on the Sermon on the Mount considered in the light of conditions today. Dr. Atkins brings to his interpretations of the Sermon, and especially of the Beatitudes, much aptness of illustration, as well as the freshness of the hillside. The final wonder of Christ's words, he says, is in their overtones: "There are passages in the discourse as near music as spoken words have ever become". Christ's words carry new and imperishable meanings. On page 52 there is a criticism of Matthew Arnold as outmoded. But it is not so sure that Arnold would not have traced much of our present troubles to our "Philistinism"—the lack of what the Sermon on the Mount is full of, "sweetness and light". This is a very timely Lent book.

Dr. Geoffrey Nuttall's *The Holy Spirit and Ourselves* (Blackwell, 5s.) is quiet in its appeal, but it has the strength which goes with quiet. Its interpretation of the Holy Spirit as the unifying and guiding power in the Church and in the individual life is very clear, and it goes far to answer many of the questions which arise under such a belief. In particular the chapter on the guidance of the Spirit is most helpful in its balanced judgment and its emphasis on the place of reason and conscience. This is also true of what Dr. Nuttall says of the discipline of the Spirit. He avoids all unreality and all that is morbid. This little book has behind it scholarship and a spiritual apprehension which make it an excellent introduction to further study of its subject.

The Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith's *The Theology of P. T. Forsyth* (Lutterworth Press, 6s.) is a very good outline and summary of Dr. Forsyth's theology; and it manages to convey an impression, and I think a right impression, of the manner of man Forsyth was. There was something deeply personal to himself about all Forsyth taught, for it was founded on a profound spiritual experience and change of thought, not unlike those mystical experiences of which the Church has seen so many forms. I have on my shelves one of his first books, *Rome, Reaction and Reform*, given

me nearly 50 years ago by a brother minister of that day. As far back as that a few of us in the backwoods were reading Forsyth and following the scent of a fresh trail. For a long time he was distrusted. Happily it is different now, and we are reprinting his works. Mr. Griffith's book is all to the point, and will be found a good introduction to Forsyth's teaching.

Dr. Denis Gwynn's *Father Dominic Barberi* (Burns, Oates, 12s. 6d.) throws some sidelights on the period of the Oxford Movement, and shows among other things how far the English Catholics of that day were from understanding the inwardness of the movement, and how different their mind was from Newman's. He was of another school, and another temperament; his arrival amongst them makes one think of Gulliver coming to Lilliput. This partly explains the frustration of Newman's life after 1845, and its tragedy which was not covered up by making him too late in the day a Cardinal. Father Dominic came to England convinced that he was to convert the country to the Roman Church. Dr. Gwynn describes his labours and his courageous spirit; but Dominic remains chiefly interesting as the man who on that rainswept night at Littlemore received Newman. One would like to have seen this man before whom John Henry Newman knelt, and asked to be admitted by him to the Church of Christ. Dr. Gwynn has written a very readable book. It will be appreciated best by those who know the story of those embittered days.

Dr. H. E. Fosdick's *On Being Fit To Live With* (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.) contains twenty-five sermons dealing with conditions following the war. Although the book has a catching title the sermons are popular in a healthy way. They make the right points for the present time. The illustrations are often striking in themselves and striking for their application. Dr. Fosdick quotes Woodrow Wilson's saying, "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually". These are not great sermons, but they have the ring of reality.

Dr. H. Sloane Coffin's *God Confronts Man in History* (Scribners, 10s. 6d.) contains lectures which he delivered in various countries during a tour made at the invitation of the American Board of Foreign Missions. Some of the titles are "God's Self-Revelation", "God's Redemptive Work", and "The Goal of History". An opening chapter gives some account of Dr. Coffin's tour, and has much information about missionary work in Siam, China and India.

Dr. H. M. Relton's book on the Atonement, *Cross and Altar* (Skeffington, 8s. 6d.) is of more than ordinary interest. It is a singular blending of the Evangelical and Sacramental views of Christ's death, and of His present work in the Church. It is not an easy book to read, and in some places is rather like classroom notes; but for all that it represents a theology with a passion of life in it, and not a dry dialectic. I rather think Dr. Relton owes something to Forsyth. The book crowds more into a small space than can be always clear, and possibly Dr. Relton does not quite appreciate how very close to "the numinous" in the Cross a man can come without any ecclesiastical doctrine of Sacraments. That is not to say that there is not a sacramental element in life; nor that Zwinglianism is a sufficient account of the Lord's Supper. My own sympathies go a long way with what Dr. Relton says about the Communion Service; but when he goes on, as he seems to, towards making the Cross and the Altar equal partners in our redemption, I say no; we are saved by the Cross and not the Altar. As Robert Mackintosh once put it, or in words something like this, we are not saved by eating a consecrated wafer, but by the love of God in Christ who gave Himself for us. This is a very suggestive book.

Bishop Stephen Neill's *Christ, His Church and His World* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 6s.) is a Church of England Lent book for this year. It contains an interesting survey of missionary work in a chapter called "The Great Century". The first chapter is one of those devastating accounts of things as they are; necessary perhaps, but is not this kind of thing being overdone? The latter part of the book has a certain resilience of new life.

The Rev. Lewis Maclachlan's *Defeat Triumphant* (Fellowship of Reconciliation, 5s.) discusses the nature of God's redemptive work in Christ, and in some detail the place of the Cross and its implications. Love all powerful, and forgiveness to the uttermost without any guard of self-defence, these are the qualities and graces which keep us from obstructing the power of Christ's appeal. A chapter on forgiveness reviews the New Testament teaching on this point. Canon Raven contributes a Foreword to the book.

A. T. S. JAMES.

Dr. T. H. Robinson's *The Poetry of the Old Testament* (Duckworth, 6s.) may be regarded as a companion volume to his well-known book on the prophets and will have an assured place alongside its predecessor. It is the fruit of the author's many years' study of the subject, and we know that we are in safe hands. There are two introductory chapters, the first on "Prose and Poetry" (based on a lecture by Mr. E. C. Llewellyn, Professor of English in University College, Cardiff), and the second on "The Forms of Hebrew Verse", an excellent brief sketch. After a chapter on the isolated poems to be found in the books from *Genesis* to 2 *Kings*, which are classified in five groups, and on some Psalms outside the Psalter, Dr. Robinson treats in considerable detail the structure of *Job*. There follow three chapters on the Psalms, their classification and the purpose of their composition, and a chapter each on *Proverbs*, *The Song of Songs*, and *Lamentations*. A useful bibliography by Prof. A. R. Johnson, the author's successor at Cardiff, concludes a book which should be on the shelves of every lover of the Old Testament.

Canon W. L. Knox, who has put us in his debt by several notable books, has published a series of lectures on *The Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.), in which he discusses its authorship, sources, historical value, and theology. He comes to the conclusion that Luke is, within his own limits, a reliable historian, who has, to mention one important matter, preserved the primitive Christian theology, as distinct from Paul's more developed thought. In a careful appendix Canon Knox demolishes A. C. Clark's linguistic arguments for difference of authorship of *Luke* and *Acts*. This is only a small book, but it is packed with solid scholarship, and distinguished by exegetical brilliance. The chapter on the theology of *Acts* seems to me the best part of a book which deserves the careful attention of those who are prepared to work through it seriously. It is not for those who are in a hurry.

Dr. S. C. Carpenter's *A Paraphrase of Selections from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 3d.) is similar to his booklet on *Philippians* (noted in the April 1947 number), and contains an introduction, some notes, and questions for group discussion. The paraphrases are competently done.

A. J. B. HIGGINS.

The Jewish New Year Festival, by Professor N. H. Snaith (S.P.C.K., 13s. 6d.), traces the development of the calendar in ancient Israel with the ultimate object of refuting Mowinckel's theory of an annual enthronement festival of Jehovah. The author believes that before the Exile the

New Year began with the harvest full moon and was celebrated with a harvest festival; that the change of calendar at the time of the Exile involved a serious modification of the pre-exilic feast; and that the modern association of the New Year with Jehovah the king dates from the time of Hadrian. His well-ordered argument falls something short of proof, but in mustering his evidence he has some interesting things to say, particularly about the Sabbath and the coronation psalms.

G. B. CAIRD.

Very many books by Sir S. Radhakrishnan have been reviewed in these columns. In *The Bhagavadgita* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) he provides not only a Sanskrit Text and English Translation but an illuminating Introductory Essay and Notes suggesting parallels to its teaching not only in Eastern but in Western writings. English students of this most influential of all Hindu books are already well provided with precise and literal translations. This edition may help us to understand not only what the writer of the *Gita* taught but what that teaching means to the most distinguished exponent of Neo-Hinduism who once more reveals the astonishing range of his reading and his gift of bringing, if not into unity yet into association, ideas derived from very different sources.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Those who have read the Bishop of Birmingham's *The Rise of Christianity* should not miss Sir Frederick Kenyon's *The Bible and Modern Scholarship* (Murray, 3s. 6d.), in which not only is the outcome of modern research stated constructively, but the Bishop's "imbecility of scholarship", ignoring as it does "almost wholly the results of the last fifty years", is castigated. The book may be read profitably alongside Professor C. H. Dodd's reply to the Bishop in *Christian Beginnings* (Epworth Press, 6d.)

Founders of the Faith in Wales: Sylfaenwyr y Ffydd yng Nghymru (Liverpool: Brython Press, 10s. 6d.), by Anita Tregarneth and John Pierce, contains notes of 46 Welsh saints in alphabetical order, first in English and then in Welsh. It is concerned mainly with the legends attached to their lives and with the churches and wells which go by their names.

John Fergusson was a young Scot of ancient family who was a pupil at Philip Doddridge's academy, till the 1745 rebellion diverted him into the army. Mr. James Fergusson has had family papers on which to draw, and in *John Fergusson*, 1727-1750 (Cape, 10s. 6d.) has made an attractive pattern, with many sidelights both on the real nature of the '45 and on Doddridge's educational methods. Over 30 letters from Doddridge not included in his *Correspondence* are printed, and express, in Doddridge's inimitable way, his combination of satisfaction at securing a pupil so well-born, genuine affection for the "dear lad", and equally genuine dismay "to see so fine a genius sunk in indolence. Mornings are lost in bed. . . ."

Mr. H. S. Bennett brings *George Gordon Coulton, 1858-1947* (Cumberlege, from Proc. Brit. Acad., 3s. 6d.) movingly before the reader, with "his tall emaciated figure", "his bright blue eyes, and the old-world courtesy of his manner", "completely sincere, completely unselfconscious"; he adds a frank appraisal of Coulton's reputation as a historian, and of the harm done to it by an enthusiasm for controversy.

The Middle Span (Constable, 8s. 6d.) is Professor George Santayana's title for the second part of his entertaining autobiography. Entertaining it is, as he describes "The Background of my Life" with "a satirical survey" of "the persons and places that have left vivid images in my mind"; but

there is too much background (England, Europe and America), and not enough Santayana. "I was, and I liked to remain, an unrecognized wanderer": "I was notoriously content with looking on"; all very charming, but reminiscences rarely absorb unless they suggest some purposiveness and initiative, at least in the writing. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Theological students, with examinations to prepare for, will be grateful for Dr. A. B. Crabtree's study: *Jonathan Edwards' View of Man* (Rel. Educ. Press, 2s. 6d.). It is a scholarly analysis, with comment, of one aspect of the teaching of a great figure in eighteenth-century Calvinism. Most readers would renew their gratitude that we have been delivered from a theology which places its main emphasis upon sin, rather than upon the fact that we have been created and redeemed in Jesus Christ. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Dom Pierre Célestin Lou Tseng-Tsiang was a Chinese diplomat who became a Roman Catholic late in life and is now a Benedictine monk in a Belgian monastery. In *Ways of Confucius and of Christ* (Burns, Oates, 10s. 6d.) he has written movingly of his experiences and declared that the salvation of his country can only be through Roman Catholicism. He regards as his tutors unto Christ both his early Confucianism and the Protestantism to which he was introduced by L.M.S. workers in China. How many Roman Christians can rise to the same tolerance? Many readers of this book will feel at the end that there is no unbridgeable gulf between saint and man of affairs.

A better title for *The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism*, by Dr. Karl Barth (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), would be "Barth's teaching about Baptism, with emphasis on its non-magical character, and strong condemnation of infant baptism". The able translation is by the Rev. E. A. Payne, who has done well in the interest of Baptist principles not to despise *tale et tanti nominis auxilium.*

The 12 B.B.C. talks on *What I Believe* are now available in book form (Porcupine Press, 3s. 6d.). It is not a tonic for failing belief, for there is too great a variety of beliefs here presented, from the extreme represented by Russell and Haldane to the Christian orthodoxy of Mgr. Knox, Dean Matthews and Dr. Whale, and the less conventional orthodoxy of Mrs. Bliss. Christian Science, Judaism and Spiritualism are also represented. Careful argument and absence of special pleading make this book well worth study.

Religion in the Twentieth Century, edited by Vergilius Ferm (New York: The Philosophical Library, $5.00), is a collection of 28 essays on contemporary religious movements, rather less than half of the essays being on Christian Churches, and 10 on Eastern faiths. It makes a useful book of reference, and is scholarly and well produced, each chapter having a short bibliography. The chapter on the Eastern Orthodox Church is admirable in view of the prevailing half-ignorance among Christians about it, and many will for similar reasons find the description of what religions like Buddhism stand for today equally admirable. The brief exposition of Humanism is also useful, though it suffers from having the American *milieu* mainly in view, as do the two chapters on Judaism. The point of view of the editor is that from which it appears possible to be, in Dean Inge's phrase, "an honorary member of all religions", transcendentalism and belief in revelation being jettisoned in process of conversion, and emphasis on tradition being regarded as mere antiquarianism, "the horse and buggy type" of religion (to quote Ferm's own expression). This, however—fortunately—is not the attitude of the various contributors.

Professor H. P. van Dusen's *World Christianity* (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.) is excellent and fills a gap in literature about the World Church. If read as widely as it merits, it will do much to arouse and inform interest in the Church as a world force. It assumes the results of Latourette's work and points the moral with lucid argument. The author has the power of selecting relevant facts from earlier history and making it seem contemporary. The book is well documented with reference both to the earlier centuries of the Church's life and to events within the œcumenical movement since 1910; and not the least valuable part of it is the bulky appendix of 34 pages listing significant events of œcumenical significance since 1795. It constitutes a powerful plea for the cementing of our growing experience of unity as a World Church and for the true theological apprehension of this. A book to put into the hands of young people who are not quite sure that the service of Christ in His Church is big enough to demand their full allegiance.

E. C. Blackman.

It is a commonplace that the influence of the Quakers is altogether disproportionate to their numbers, and a paradox that they are best known by their wartime exertions directed towards the relief of suffering. The history of the *Friends Ambulance Unit* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.), by Mr. A. Tegla Davies, is "a record of goodwill and positive service", covering ground which it is not within the competence of most official war-histories to traverse. In saying that a book of five hundred pages on such a theme is overlong, and that a meticulous regard for detail makes for tedious reading, one does not forget that the book is primarily a history of the F.A.U.—a voluntary organization, which, while sponsored and guided largely by Friends, remained to the end independent of the Society's official control. The Unit saw service at home, in Scandinavian and Balkan countries, in the Near East and the Far East, in North Africa, in Italy, in Germany; with the field armies, in prison camps, among air-raid victims and displaced persons. In Europe alone, the F.A.U. was deployed on a scale second only to the Red Cross. Over sixty illustrations and six maps add to the book's interest and usefulness.

The scope of Mr. David Hinshaw's *An Experiment in Friendship* (Benn, 8s. 6d.) is defined by its sub-title "A Study of Quaker Relief Work". For this gripping account of a notable piece of altruistic service, Dr. Rufus M. Jones writes an Introduction. Sandwiched in the middle of the text are sixteen pages of first-class illustrations. H. Cunliffe Jones.

The Church of our Fathers (S.C.M. Press, 12s. 6d.), by Professor Roland H. Bainton, a history of the Church for older boys and girls and youth, is notable alike for the comprehensiveness of its survey and for the author's judicious selection and statement of facts. Prof. Bainton knows how to write so as to interest his readers, and he is well supported by the numerous illustrations from contemporary sources, and by the attractive manner in which this book has been produced. An account of the Church in America is included. It is, perhaps, a pity that the American spelling and a few grammatically loose expressions have been retained. The quotation on p. 32 should be "In hoc signo vinces"; the title of Robert Browne's work on p. 191 is incorrect; and Bunyan is misquoted on p. 193.

In *End of an Era* (Livingstone Press, 3s. 6d.), the Rev. E. Rowlands has written an account of the experiences of the Christians, British and native, of the Central China Mission field of the London Missionary Society from the time of the Japanese invasion of China to the end of the war. It is a grim

story that he relates, but a story illumined by the transformation of catastrophes into opportunities for Christian unity and service. Here is more than a record of events; it is a testimony of faith.

A composite record of the experiences (particularly of internment) of some twenty members of the Baptist Missionary Society who were in China during the war with Japan is found in *Through Toil and Tribulation* (Carey Press, 6s.). The occasional repetitions are more than compensated for by the fulness of the description given of "weary and bitter" years faced with Christian gallantry.

The Rev. J. Spencer Trimingham's *The Christian Approach to Islam in The Sudan* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.) contains a valuable statement of missionary policy and Government attitude towards Islam and Christian missions in the past. The ways in which the present opportunity is to be seized are stated in detail, and form an important contribution to missionary policy. The writer believes that the missionary's attitude should be not a self-conscious determination to conquer Islam, but one of witnessing to the new life that Christ gives to individuals and to the indigenous Christian community, a life at once fertile and stable.

The Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly has produced, for Service chaplains and newly appointed missionaries, four booklets on the religions of the East. The booklets are excellent and should prove of value to study circles and the general reader, for they contain clear, interesting and well informed accounts of the Eastern religions, viewed in relation to the contemporary scene, religious and secular. The titles are: *The Mind of Japan : and the Religions of the Japanese* (2s.), by Bishop Heaslett; *The Mind and Ways of Islam* (2s. 6d.), by Miss Mabel C. Warburton, who writes especially about the Middle East, and there is a chapter on Islam in India, by Mr. Robert Stokes; *Ancient Faiths and Lore of India* (2s. 6d.), by the Rev. C. S. Milford and W. R. Garrad; *Chinese Philosophy and Religion* (2s. 6d.), by the Rev. F. A. Smalley.

Dr. T. Howard Somervell is a born guide. In *India Calling* (Livingstone Press, 6s.) he looks at India, specially the State of Travancore, with the eyes of a traveller, Christian and doctor and introduces us to the land and some of the peoples, their ways of life and needs. There are some three dozen photographs to illustrate the text.

The *Six Missionaries in Africa* whose work and achievements the Rev. Cecil Northcott and Miss Joyce Reason describe in the "Living Names" series, published by Oxford Press (1s. 3d.), are Robert Moffat, David Livingstone, James Stewart, Alexander Mackay, Mary Slessor and Albert Cook. The Christian spiritedness of these people is skilfully delineated, making this booklet a glowing exposition of the necessity of Christian missions.

The Living Christ in Modern China (Carey Press, 7s. 6d.), by the Rev. George A. Young, is a testimony to the reality of the living Christ, as evidenced in the author's call to service and the blessings that have attended his evangelistic ministry, under the Shensi Baptist Mission. This lively book should stimulate and enthuse Christian workers.

It is to be hoped that *The Christian Handling of Divorce : A Free Church Exposition* (Independent Press, 4d.), a statement prepared by the Joint Social Service Committee of the Baptist and Congregational Unions of England and Wales and the English Presbyterian Church, will receive from Ministers and Fraternals the consideration it merits, and form the subject of addresses and discussion. If the statement should, by a seeming scholarly remoteness, cause the minister immersed in pastoral and other duties to feel impatient, he should realize that here is an unambiguous guide which calls him to reconsider his working-principles. Our criticism of the statement is

that if it is intended to be read by the more educated member of our Churches, it could with advantage have been more explanatory and part of a wider survey; if it is intended for the average member, some much more popular statement is required.

HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

The Call to Worship (Carey Press, 5s.), by the Rev. D. Tait Patterson, contains useful, varied and sympathetic collections first of sentences and then of prayers for the main moods of worship and the great events of the Christian Year. They are culled largely from ancient and historical sources. The third part on Orders for Ordinances and Offices again has serviceable material, but bears out the wisdom of omitting any attempt at order earlier in the book. The music for responses has been selected and arranged by Sir George Dyson.

KENNETH G. OGILVIE.

Mr. Norman Lacey's *Wordsworth's View of Nature and its Ethical Consequences* (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.) darts some keen rays into its subject, even though it leaves much of it unilluminated. Mr. Lacey is conscious of Wordsworth's essentially religious spirit and of many ways in which he typifies "lost" modern man. Why, despite his insight, his sense of the numinous, his strong belief that the universe is animated in every part by a living Spirit, is Wordsworth not a great religious poet? Because, perhaps, distrusting the intellect too much, he never really worked out his philosophy of Nature, penetrating through "Nature" to the God behind it. This is an honest book, and in such casual remarks as "Nature throughout *The Prelude* seems to be a force with very much the same attributes as his mother's love" (p. 34) and "He put the dalesmen in inverted commas" (p. 124), the author shows at once his penetration and his command of the felicitous phrase.

W. R. NIBLETT.

In 1821 Sir Walter Scott composed a series of letters purporting to be genuine seventeenth century productions. These he abandoned, but adapted the material to the construction of his novel, *The Fortunes of Nigel*. The letters themselves are now published, for the first time in full, in *Private Letters of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.), edited by Mr. Douglas Grant. In his introduction, which occupies almost exactly half the book, Mr. Grant claims for the letters that they are "One of the magnificent fragments to which time has reduced the works of Scott".

English Institute Essays: 1946 (Columbia University Press; London: Cumberlege, 14s.) is a selection of papers by various hands on two connected themes, the critical significance of biographical evidence, and the methods of literary studies. In the first part of the book four scholars examine the relevance of biography to the understanding of the works, respectively, of Milton, Swift, Shelley and Yeats. They agree—and we cannot but agree with them—that biographical interpretation can easily be, and has been, carried too far, particularly in the case of Swift. It is more reasonable to interpret a writer's character in the light of his works than to attempt the opposite, a process which too often involves the turning of "biographical conjecture into biographical fact". The second part demonstrates the interdependence and unity of purpose among specialists, from the textual critic to the literary historian. There is something of value in this book for all who are concerned with criticism in theory or practice. Perhaps the most illuminating essay is Mr. R. Wellek's "Six Types of Literary History".

Mr. Clifford Dyment's *Matthew Arnold* (Phœnix House, 8s. 6d.), an addition to the "Poets on the Poets" series, consists of a brief but excellent introductory essay, a portrait, and 264 pages of poems. These are arranged in five sections, Poems of Unrest, Love Poems, Narrative and Dramatic, Elegiac, and Poems of Rest. Mr. Dyment holds that Arnold's value for us today is that "in an age of materialism he affirmed the primacy of the spirit". Arnold is not in any way a difficult poet, and in allowing him to speak for himself without critical notes or comment, Mr. Dyment shows wisdom as well as modesty. For 'a certain willingness not to know' is as essential to the appreciation as to the creation of poetry.

It is natural enough that in *Body and Soul* (Harrap, 15s.) Mr. John Brophy should devote most of his space to the body. He not only describes in some detail its structure and capacities, but also discusses the questions of beauty, nakedness, costume and fashion, and the sexual impulse. In giving a clear statement of the problem Mr. Brophy says very well all that can be said concerning the mysterious relationship between the body and the soul, and, in a passage remarkable for its sincerity and conviction, he concludes that the Christian is the only ethic that can satisfy the whole man. If somewhat disconnected, this book contains much out of the way information and some suggestive ideas. It is illustrated with drawings by old and modern masters which show the human body, male and female, in youth and age, in action and at rest. Most of these have never before been reproduced.

P. A. Spalding.

"A highly religious temperament smarting under the weight of an anti-religious outlook": in *Nietzsche : An Approach*, by Professor Janko Lavrin (Methuen, 7s. 6d.), Nietzsche is viewed in relation to his pronouncements on politics and religion, ethics, antiquity, and 'good Europeanism'; and finally set in illuminating comparison with Dostoevsky. The book is brief but far from superficial. It is the kind of approach to Nietzsche which helps us both to understand and to handle with more assurance the crisis of contemporary man.

Conrad Bonifazi.

Has the artist any special authority to speak to society, or to assess his own work? *Letters of Eric Gill* (Cape, 15s.), edited by Mr. Walter Shewring, show once again this very considerable artist of our own time with much to say both about his creative work and its relation to society—always with force and often with very good sense indeed. The *Letters* also tell us much about his ordinary life and about the production of particular well-known works. Those who know either the man or his work will not wish to be without this revealing book.

There is no need to commend Miss Flora Thompson's *Still Glides The Stream* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.) to readers of her earlier *Lark Rise to Candleford*. For the benefit of others it may be said that it is a story of English village life in the later years of the 19th century. Miss Thompson sees the village of Restharrow neither as an impossible paradise in the cloying mists of sentimental memory nor as a collection of human clods with stinkweed rife in the hedges. She writes of peasant life as it was: hard, sometimes beautiful or pathetic, always ill-paid but often rewarding. And how well she writes, with the appreciation of someone who shared that life and yet is able to see it from outside. Whether as a social document of a life that is gone, or as pure literature, here is a book to be welcomed with gratitude.

Challenge To Oppression (S.C.M., 4s. 6d.) is a descriptive biography

of Charles Dickens by the Rev. McEwan Lawson. The title suggests the main emphasis, but Mr. Lawson is concerned to show the wealth of Dickens' observation and understanding of character as well as his sympathy for the unfortunate and underprivileged.

In *To Tell My Daughter* (Rodney Phillips & Green, 8s. 6d.) Mrs. Jean Curtis Brown describes her childhood in a Presbyterian Manse in Cheshire. Though there were restrictions it was not a life of continued inhibition likely to cause serious neuroses later on, nor was it such as to produce ready-made saints. To belong to the Manse conferred a high privilege and a certain isolation; but the far greater difference is between any household of similar social standing then and now.

K. W. WADSWORTH.

Teachers who are looking for ready-made lesson notes will find much help in *Myself and My Creed* (Wallington: Religious Education Press, 5s.) in which several writers in collaboration have furnished material for 43 lessons, undenominational in character, on the Apostles' Creed, which finds a place in many of the best Agreed Syllabuses. All the lessons are given Biblical references, exercises are suggested, and as the notes are over-full, there is room for the teacher to select what he thinks most suitable.

In *The Education of Girls* (Faber, 8s. 6d.) Mr. John Newsom makes a smashing attack on contemporary educational practice. He shows that what girls are taught in school is as little related to their natural interests as to their social function, and he brings evidence to prove that the course of study served to all is determined partly by the vocational needs of the very few, and partly by the assumption that the educational opportunities of boys and girls must be identical in order to be equal. As a county education officer, Mr. Newsom has access to all such facts as time-allotment within the curriculum; as a human being he has followed individual girls through a typical day; and those who know girls' schools from within cannot but recognize that the picture he paints is ludicrously true of many: there are others, however, which give considerable attention to the making of wise purchasers and capable cooks. The case for radical re-thinking of girls' education is a strong one, and Mr. Newsom rightly affirms that the present situation cannot be remedied without a revolution in the recruitment and training of teachers.

KATHLEEN L. CARRICK SMITH.

Lawless Youth (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) is a valuable book resulting from meetings between experts of twelve European nations. Several chapters, of challenging interest to any knowledgeable layman, analyze and make constructive suggestions about the principles and practice of the treatment of young lawbreakers, men and women as well as juveniles, about the composition and powers of youth courts, and about the prevention of delinquency by remedying defects in the general social background: the appendices, giving accounts of methods employed in ten countries, are of value chiefly to more serious students of the subject.

JOHN HOARE.

In *Hen dy Cwrdd Cefn Coed y Cymmer* (Llandyssul: Gomerian Press, 7s. 6d.) Mr. Tom Lewis has written (in English) a most interesting account of the Old Meeting House at Cefn near Merthyr Tydfil. Its history goes back to the seventeenth century, with a reputed gathering in 1620 at a neighbouring farmhouse; it is now Unitarian. The writer knows his subject well and loves his heritage.

The Rev. G. H. Peters' *Life and Work of Humphrey Gainsborough* (Henley: Higgs, 2s. 6d.) deserves to be read far and wide. Gainsborough, the artist's brother, was not only Congregational minister at Henley from 1748 to 1776 but road-maker, bridge-builder and inventor as well. This is an admirably careful piece of work.

C. E. SURMAN.

When he died, Professor Bronislaw Malinowski had almost completed a book in which he had brought his vast anthropological knowledge to bear on the question of freedom in relation to society. The work has now been published under the title *Freedom and Civilization* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.). His wife, who edited the book, noted that it contained some repetition which would probably have been removed in revision. There is more than she seems to have realized and some judicious pruning would help. The book was written during the war and in some minor points is out of date, *e.g.* in its supposition that there would be a "peace table" at the end of hostilities; but in many respects events have added cogency to the author's words. Professor Malinowski is much concerned with the problems confronting democracy, and with the abolition of war, which he believes can be got rid of because it is a social institution and not a biological necessity. This is without question an important book.

By writing *The Free Society* (Andrew Dakers, 12s. 6d.) Mr. John Middleton Murry must have made himself—not for the first time—a centre of controversy. He believes that the existence of the free society is in dire peril, and that nothing can save it except the establishment of a world government in which the democratic principle is accepted. He holds that the one and only obstacle to the creation of such an authority is Russia, which does not, it is true, want war at the moment, but which equally does not want the *abolition* of war. Abjuring his pacifism he is prepared to consider the possibility that a war should be fought to compel Russia to come into line. Such a war would be "the one just war"—a war to end war. It may be asked whether Mr. Murry is quite certain that a democratic world order would be established even if Russia were decisively beaten. It is possible that "the free society" would be destroyed in some of the countries where it now exists. He asks, among other pertinent questions, whether communists, whose aim is to destroy all toleration and to annihilate conscience, do not themselves forfeit the right to toleration. This is not a book with which everybody will agree, but it is one which everybody should read.

L. J. TIZARD.

SMALL BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

The Dawn Breaks (Carey Press, 5s.), by W. D. Grenfell, is an account of missionary work at Sao Salvador, Portuguese Congo, which contains much information about the life and customs of the natives, supposedly described by a pious and likeable bit of brown mud.

The India Book (Livingstone Press, 3s. 6d.), edited by Miss Joyce Reason, describes the past and present work of the London Missionary Society in India—and in a very interesting way. Here also are stories about prominent missionaries, and native ways and industries, as well as fables and legends. This attractively produced book should be popular with the children.

The Rev. Ronald Rees' *News From China* (Edinburgh House Press, 1s.) should be read by all who desire information about post-war China presented reliably and concisely.

Six Coloured Marbles (L.P., 1s.), by Gladys M. Rumpus, is a short, well told tale, attractively produced, for small children.

Through The Little Book (Lutterworth Press, 6s.), by Donald Plumley, is an unusual book which should interest boys and girls in the Old Testament stories and lead them to desire to know more, whether or no they were previously acquainted with the Bible. It is the tale of a boy and girl who meet a strange little man with the gift of transporting them into the scenes described in his little black book, the Bible. Mr. Plumley writes well, and this book should prove stimulating to teachers or acceptable to children as a gift.

The Rev. Douglas A. Smith's talks to children, *Castles in the Air* (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.), contain valuable thoughts, each conveyed through an apt story or incident; and he has appended "further suggestions" to them.

The Book Speaks Again (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.), by Dr. H. Elvet Lewis, consists of addresses to children based on New Testament texts. The addresses are full of grace and wisdom.

The book for the Sunday School superintendent, teacher or pianist who is getting stale, or fears he may be, is the *Sunday School Ideas Book* (National Sunday School Union, 7s. 6d.), by Mr. S. G. Hedges. It contains practical suggestions on many aspects of Sunday School work, and deserves to be widely read and used.

HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

NEW EDITIONS

Marriage in Church and State (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.) is a new edition of the well known book by Canon T. A. Lacey, first published in 1912, which has been fully revised and in part rewritten by Canon R. C. Mortimer, the Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology at Oxford. We are grateful to the S.P.C.K. for making this concise and learned history of the laws of marriage and divorce in Christendom once more available, whilst the final pages give not only a precise account of recent changes in the marriage laws but a clear and uncompromising statement of the Anglo-Catholic attitude to problems of marriage and divorce.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Religion in the Victorian Era, by Dr. L. E. Elliott-Binns (Lutterworth Press, 21s.), is a new edition of a careful and balanced survey first published in 1936.

Mr. Gerald Bullett's "anthology of the religious spirit", *The Testament of Light* (Dent, 8s. 6d.) is now published, with additions and revisions, in one volume.

The text of *The Pilgrim's Progress,* by John Bunyan (Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.), illustrated by Mr. Gwilym O. Griffith, has been carefully prepared from the editions published in Bunyan's lifetime.

The seventh edition of *Everyday Religion* (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.), by the Bishop of Lichfield, has been fully revised and largely rewritten. Its general usefulness is greatly increased by the addition of a chapter on "Christianity and Politics".

ALSO RECEIVED

The Kingship of Christ. W. A. Visser 't Hooft. S.C.M., 4s. Chapters on the trends of thought in the Reformation Churches of the Continent.

Some Principles of Evangelism. S.P.C.K., 2s. Lectures to the clergy of the Deanery of Gloucester, by Canon E. C. Rich of Peterborough.

Divine Election. J. Russell. Barton Press, 1s. A catena of Biblical passages without adequate discussion. A better shillingsworth is *Papal Claims,* by A. Mortain (S.P.C.K.), a repudiation of R.C. authoritarianism; careful and well documented, though lack of references to non-Anglican scholars (*e.g.,* Harnack, Cadoux, Lindsay) is noticeable.

Human Forgiveness. A. Hall. Lindsey Press, 1s. Interesting in a discursive way, but inadequate because it operates with an insufficiently radical conception of sin and guilt and lacks a discussion of the meaning of the Cross.

Barchester Towers. Anthony Trollope. *Westward Ho!* Charles Kingsley. In "The Modern Reading Library". Todd Publishing Group, Ltd., 6s. each. While retaining the author's words, the original works are skilfully reduced in length, by the elimination of elements subsidiary to the main plot.

Compass for Pilot Captains. Livingstone Press, 2s. 3d. A comprehensive handbook about Pilots, the Children's Organization.

When the Song Began. G. Hicks. Carey Press, 2s. 6d. Some impressions and recollections of missionary work in Gaya.

The Changing Congo. L. Gwendoline Pugh. Carey Press, 2s. Changes and contrasts in Congo, observed by a missionary there for thirty-two years.

Teamwork for Health in Central China. K. H. Gillison and H. O. Chapman. Livingstone Press, 6d. An account of the Central China Christian Medical Union, its draft constitution and aims, and the needs it attempts to meet.

Why We Need John Williams Six. Joyce Reason. Livingstone Press, 4d. A useful brief sketch.

1698—And After. S.P.C.K. The story of the S.P.C.K. in brief, including the Programme of Celebrations.

Creative Freedom. Herbert Crabtree. *Abiding Values.* Magnus C. Ratter. Nos. 9 and 10 respectively in "Religion in a Changing World Series". Lindsey Press, 6d. each.

Can We Believe In God? G. M. Day. 75 cents. Lenten Sermons. *Advance Into Light.* J. W. Kennedy. 50 cents. Good Friday or Holy Week meditations. Louisville: The Cloister Press.

Starving Castle. Charles Wootton. Rodney Phillips & Green, 8s. 6d. Mystery tale with secret passages, racketeers, *etc.*

Lay Preacher's Guide. G. A. Birks and T. Brett Davies. Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d. This useful little book shows how anyone can prepare and conduct a service from first to last without any recourse to God whatever.

The Administration of the Lord's Supper. Wm. Robinson. Berean Press, 1s. 6d. Very reverent and straightforward directions for the conduct of the service in the Churches of Christ; well worth the study of other Christians.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (April). The first number under its new Editor, Dr. G. Stephens Spinks, begins with an address in memory of Gandhi, delivered in All Souls College by Prof. S. Radhakrishnan. In "Creed and Conscience" Dr. A. H. Birch argues that the author of *The Rise of Christianity* is not morally justified in retaining his bishopric; Dr. H. D. A. Major, in a spirited reply ("Criticism and Conscience") rallies to the defence of Dr. Barnes. Two articles come from Scottish Congregationalists: "An Ecological Study of Religion in Certain Ancient Civilisations" by Dr. John Murphy, and "The End of Communism" by the Rev. A. G. Reekie. Further contributions deal with "Christmas, Christianity and God—Some Reflections", "The Existential Philosophy" and "Constant Forms in the Flux of Change".

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (April). With two exceptions—Dr. E. L. Allen, who writes on "Authority and Freedom in East and West", and the Rev. D. R. Davies, who asks "What is Truth?" and seeks an answer in the sphere of theology—all the contributors are Methodists. Dr. W. F. Howard describes "The Seventh Ecumenical Methodist Conference" at Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1947; the Rev. H. Belshaw deals concretely with "The Problem of Christian Terminology". Two articles combine religious and literary interests: "The Card from the Five Towns" by the Rev. W. S. Handley Jones, and "G. K. Chesterton: Man of Letters and Defender of the Faith" by the Rev. John Bishop.

Expository Times (February and March). Dr. Harold Knight, writing on "The Personality of Ezekiel—Priest or Prophet?", indicates that the problem finds its most satisfactory solution when "a duality or plurality of authorship" is postulated. Dr. Vincent Taylor deals with "The Messianic Secret in Mark"—a problem raised nearly fifty years ago by Wrede; this long and important article is the forerunner of a new series on "Unsolved New Testament Problems". A Congregationalist, Dr. H. V. Martin, thinks that the rite of baptism in the New Testament Church was often self-administered. The Rev. E. W. Heaton writes on "The Joseph Saga", and Dr. John Bowman on "The Parable of the Good Samaritan".

Evangelical Quarterly (April). Against a background of forty-three years' missionary service, Dr. J. Z. Hodge writes confidently of "The Future of Christianity in Independent India"; Dr. A. W. McClymont seeks to dispel the shadow that has fallen over Schleiermacher by calling attention to elements in his theology which would repay a careful study. Dr. C. Sydney Carter has an article on "John Williams: A Statesman Bishop", and a review of the Rev. Gordon Rupp's *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition.* Of academic interest is Dr. John Bowman's long paper (twenty-two pages) on the Pharisees.

Modern Churchman (March). Dr. Geddes MacGregor gives an exposition of the thought of Jean-Paul Sartre, whose existentialism is (so he claims) a living influence, rivalled only by Marxism and Neo-Thomism, in French intellectual circles. Memories of W. T. Stead are revived by the Rev. H. R. Chillingworth's "Journalist and Crusader". The Bishop of Truro writes in philosophical terms on "Spirit and Spirit". The proposal to appoint a Chief Information Officer for the Church of England at a salary of £2,000 a year plus expenses is severely castigated by the Editor under the caption, "Good Wine needs no Bush"; this attitude may be contrasted with the Rev. S. Maurice Watts' comment from the Chair of the Congregational Union—"Sweet are the uses of *advertisement*".

Review and Expositor (April). The first article is a manifesto issued on behalf of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State—an organization which views with much alarm certain violations of the basic constitutional principle. Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed defends, vigorously and in detail, the Standard Revised Version of the New Testament published in 1946. In "The Dynamics of a Sermon", the Rev. R. Lofton Hudson pleads for a fresh emphasis in pastoral theology; more important than the logic and arrangement of the material is its relevance and vitality.

International Review of Missions (April). The Rev. Kwang Hsun Ting has a stimulating contribution on "The Impact of the New Testament on the Non-Christian"; he stresses the essential simplicity of the Gospel, especially as it appeals to an Oriental with a non-Christian background. Prof. John Foster writes agreeably on "A Scottish Contributor to the Missionary Awakening: Robert Millar of Paisley", who, in 1723, published a book advocating world-evangelization. The L.M.S. is represented by the Rev. R. K. Orchard ("Natural Law and Missionary Policy") and the Rev. J. T. Hardyman ("Church, Politics and Nationalism in Madagascar"). Miss Jessie M. Cole has an informative article on "Moral Welfare Work in the Church of England". A Methodist, Dr. H. Owen Chapman, tells of advance in "Christian Medical Co-operation in China", and a Baptist, the Rev. J. F. Carrington, describes the introduction of "African Music in Christian Worship".

Friends' Quarterly (April). The editor hopes that Gandhi's "death will achieve what his efforts while alive failed to secure—the cessation of communal strife". The speeches in connection with the presentation of the Nobel Peace Prize to the Society of Friends are given in full: (1) "The Quakers" by Mr. Gunnar Jahn (a Norwegian); (2) "The International Service of the Society of Friends" by Miss Margaret Backhouse; and (3) "The Quakers and Peace" by Prof. Henry J. Cadbury.

Baptist Quarterly (January). Dr. Hugh Martin, writing in carefully defined terms on "Protestantism and the State", summarizes the Lutheran, Calvinistic and Anglican positions. Dr. E. K. Jones continues his series of articles on "Welsh Baptist Polity" with an interesting though discursive description of "Life in a Welsh Baptist Church", which may be compared with the Rev. Maurice F. Hewett's factual account of "The Church at Shelfanger".

Anglican Theological Review (October and January). The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger deals frankly and wittily with "Contemporary Anglicanism and the Challenge of our Time"; though concerned naturally with the American scene, many of his observations are applicable to the English situation. The Rev. Holt Hutton Graham thinks that *The Apostolic Ministry* deals inadequately with the relation of the Church to the Kingdom of God. "Worship in the Reformed Tradition" by the Rev. Morgan P. Noyes (a Presbyterian) is of interest to students of liturgiology; not all that the Rev. Sydney A. Temple, Jr., claims in "The Anglican Communion in Social Change" will convince his brethren.

Religion in Life (Spring). A good number, in which all the fourteen articles deal with living issues. That is true equally of contributions such as "Preparation for Amsterdam" (Prof. John C. Bennett) and "What is the City Doing to Christian Life?" (Prof. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy) which directly touch modern concerns, and of the reprint of "The Private Devotions" by Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626). An English Congregationalist, the Rev. Cecil Northcott, writes on "Christianity and Liberty"; Judge Otto Stargardt relates a moving story of "Christianity in a Concentration Camp".

Review of Religion (January). Prints a series of papers on the theme, "Religion and Democracy". The concept of democracy defies clear-cut definition, but the ideas of liberty, fraternity and equality, associated with the French Revolution, are considered normative. The scope of the articles is indicated by the following titles: "Democracy and Revelation", "The Idea of Democracy in Contemporary Catholicism", "Modern Protestantism and Democracy", and "The Relation of Religion to Democracy and Communism in the writings of John Macmurray".

Teachers of Today (March-May). The Rev. J. Clark Gibson begins a new series —"Our New Social Problem"—with "The Child and the Gambling Mentality". "The Child and His Environment" is by Dr. Maldwyn Edwards, and "A Philosophy of Morals as a Background to Religious Instruction" by Prof. R. Corkey. The greater length of the principal articles is a matter for appreciative comment.

Yale Review (Spring). The outstanding feature of this interesting number is the strong team of writers who deal with foreign affairs. These include Prof. Calvin B. Hoover, who has an article on "Germany and European Economic Recovery", Mr. John W. Gardner on "Are We Doing Our Homework in Foreign Affairs?", Mr. M. W. Fodor on the Danubian countries, and Mr. David Cushman Doyle on "Tolerance and Treason". Literary topics are not neglected; witness "The Metaphysical Revival" by Prof. George Whalley, and "Hawthorne and the Twilight of Romance" by Prof. R. H. Pearce.

H. Cunliffe Jones.